
CHAPTER 3.0

OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS ANALYSIS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this section is to identify, determine, and analyze opportunities and constraints that might affect the implementation of future trails within the county, such as land use, ownership, transportation, and environmental and cultural elements. In addition to the opportunities and constraints analysis, this section also includes acquisition options and methodology for acquiring private lands for trail implementation and provides an analysis of the nexus issues and possible enforcement issues. The synthesis of this information will lead to the creation of goals and recommendations that would be appropriate for future policy implementation and long-term success of a Countywide trail strategy.

3.2 OPPORTUNITES AND CONSTRAINTS

3.2.1 Land Ownership

Under land ownership there are three primary areas that affect the opportunities and constraints related to trail implementation. These areas are private lands, public lands, and semi-public lands. (See Figure 3-1: Note semipublic lands are included in the public land category on the graphic).

Private Lands

Opportunity

Private lands in the unincorporated portion of the County of San Diego consist of approximately 886,000 acres or 41 percent of the unincorporated area. The private lands have a broad range of land uses including residential, industrial, agricultural and commercial. Private lands tend to be concentrated in the western and central portions of the County as illustrated in Figure 3-1. Currently, public trails within private lands are limited to very small areas. Most trails within private lands are for the exclusive use of the associated development and the trails are not available to the general public.

In some cases the use of private lands may be critical in linking future trails to an existing network of trails located on public lands. As noted in Chapter 2, *Public Needs Assessment*, the western areas of the county have the fewest trails but they are the most populated areas. There

are insufficient public lands in this area to provide the necessary links of the current trail system to future trails. As undeveloped private lands become developed the County may choose to acquire easements for trails that are identified on these properties. Acquisition of private lands, by purchase, renewable license, or easement dedication, or conditioning new developments may be the only opportunity to provide a meaningful system of interconnected trails in the more urbanized areas of the county.

Constraints

Acquiring right-of-way or easements from private property owners for future trail implementation may be difficult without outright purchase or eminent domain measures. The current use of dedication for trails is only applicable to major subdivisions that are being processed for development. If dedication is the only method to acquire future trail easements, there may be major gaps in a future trail system.

The issues of privacy and also liability become more critical when related to private lands. Concerns from most private property owners relate to the general public coming in close proximity to their property and the associated liability that might result from injury. The concern regarding liability is less of an issue now that the County has an Indemnification Ordinance that can be used with private property owners. Another concern or constraint is maintaining a level of privacy where residential uses are adjacent to trails.

Public Lands

Opportunity

There are three primary public land ownerships or jurisdictions in the unincorporated areas of the county that account for approximately 1,400,000 acres. These include the State Parks Lands, U.S. Forest Service Lands and the Bureau of Land Management (See Figure 3-2).

Two major state parks are located in the county:

- \$ San Diego County's portion of Anza Borrego State Park is comprised of approximately 514,000 acres in the far eastern area of the County within the Desert Community Planning Area. Anza Borrego is the largest State Park in the continental United States. The park provides for a wide variety of recreational uses, and includes 420 miles of trails exclusively for the use of hikers, bikers, and equestrians. The trails in Anza Borrego provide the trail user with a unique experience of the desert environment, which is unlike the trails experience

Figure 3-1 Public Private Lands Map (11x17)

\$ Back of Figure 3-1

Figure 3-2 Land Ownerships (11x17)

Back of Figure 3-2

user with a unique experience of the desert environment, which is unlike the trails experience found in Cuyamaca Rancho State Park or other areas in the county. The number of trails within Anza Borrego makes the park a desirable destination and linking other trails to this system should be considered.

Anza Borrego State Park is currently assessing its existing trail system to determine suitability for different user types. This assessment is due in part to the increase of mountain bikers. The State is also looking for other trail opportunities in the park during its General Plan update. It is anticipated that the General Plan will be certified in two years.

The State Park system is interested in creating links to surrounding trails outside the park. Of particular interest is the extension of the trail from Volcan Mountain to the desert. The Park General Plan has policy regarding these types of trail connections and the State reviews requests on a case-by-case basis. The State does look for loop trail opportunities as well as the long linear regional trails. It should also be noted that the State has just purchased Lucky 5 Ranch near Cuyamaca Rancho State Park. This purchase would provide a direct connection from Anza Borrego State Park to Cuyamaca Rancho State Park.

- Cuyamaca Rancho State Park is an approximately 21,000-acre park with nearly 13,000 acres that are classified as wilderness. All vehicles, even bicycles, are excluded from the wilderness areas. The park is located in the more central area of the county and is within the Julian and Central Mountain Community Planning Areas. The park provides for a variety of recreational uses including picnicking, overnight camping, equestrian camping, and wilderness or primitive trail camps. Over 125 miles of trails are provided for hikers, bikers, and equestrians. With this number of existing trails in the park, linking other trails to this system should be considered.

The General Plan for Cuyamaca Rancho State Park (see Appendix L) recommends a Trail System Concept that includes varying lengths of loop trails that provide trail access to all parts of the state park. In addition the General Plan recommends that it should make efficient use of trail camps and connections to the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and County Park trail systems (see Appendix M). The State has agreements with adjacent private landowners to allow access to existing trails within the park. Their primary concern is to assure that the design standards and trail user types of the proposed trail match the State requirements. An example of this is if the State trail is for hikers only, then the trail connecting to it should also be for hikers only. These trails are known as restricted trails.

- The California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) is currently working on a joint use trail that is part of the Trans County Trail. The Parks and Recreation Department is also

preparing a trail evaluation study for possibly adding new trails in the State Parks. Currently, the fire roads are the only multi-use trails allowing all three types of trail users. All other trails are restricted use. The Parks and Recreation evaluation study will determine user types allowed and specific design standards for each new trail segment.

- The USFS Lands within San Diego County are all part of the Cleveland National Forest which is comprised of three roughly defined areas within San Diego County with a portion extending into Riverside County. Combined, these three units include approximately 285,000 acres. Recreational uses within the forest are varied with over 191 miles of trails provided for hikers, equestrians, and bikers. For trail users, the Cleveland National forest is a desirable destination that provides for a wide variety of trail experiences.

Federal recreation policies do not specifically address trail connection of offsite trails to existing trails within USFS jurisdiction. The Land Management Plan is dated (1985–86) and is rather general in its attention towards trails. However, USFS has always seen the benefit of providing connectivity to the surrounding trails and has worked towards this effort. In the past they have participated in the San Dieguito River Park trail planning and planning for possible trails located north of Ramona. The USFS is in the early stages of updating its Land Management Plan (Forest Plan) and is soliciting input from the public on the use, expectation, and need for trails. They expect the section concerning trails will receive considerable attention this time and encourages the County to participate in this effort.

- \$ The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has approximately 65,000 acres of land within the southwestern portion of San Diego County and is identified in the South Coast Resource Management Plan. There are large contiguous parcels of BLM lands in the south county near the Mexican border. There are also other smaller parcels in this resource area that are scattered in the northern part of the county. The BLM Resource Management Plan was adopted in 1997, and covers these areas. The plan identifies broad land use including a recreation component, but nothing specific to the provision of trails or trailheads.

The BLM is currently very proactive in “blocking out” sensitive habitat land. This is through the purchase of surrounding undeveloped parcels with other land conservation groups. A Management Plan will be prepared for these parcels and it is anticipated that the plan policies will be similar to the current MCSP. The BLM will also be looking for increased opportunities to provide low-impact recreation uses in these new areas, including trails. All of BLM public lands in the area south of the Interstate Highway 8 will be managed as the Border Mountains Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMA). Coordination of lands to establish uninterrupted corridors for public land in the “Border Mountains” area is a major objective.

The Otay Mountain Wilderness Area is also the responsibility of BLM. As with other wilderness areas the trails are restricted and bicycles are not permitted. Also in the wilderness area only existing trails will be maintained and no new trails will be provided. The Otay Mountain Truck Trail is within the BLM's property and travels east to west, beginning in Dulzura and ending at the Kuebler Ranch near Otay Mesa. The BLM has an easement across private land at the Kuebler Ranch assuring public access. Near the summit of Otay Mountain another road, the Minnewawa Truck Trail, connects the Otay Mountain Truck Trail with Otay Lakes Road to the north. Access to the Minnewawa Truck Trail is gated at Otay Lakes Road near the Thousand Trails RV Park and is not accessible to the public. The BLM would like to see this trail extended to connect to other trails to the west. Currently the only staging areas for trails are provided at the border for the Pacific Crest Trail. The first 15 miles of the trail begin within BLM jurisdiction. The other trails in the South Coast Management Area have no staging areas and there is no posting of existing trails on BLM lands. It is hoped that this will be addressed in future Management Plans. The County may want to explore the opportunity of assisting the BLM with signage to make better use of the existing trail.

An area that is just below and west of the Anza Borrego Desert State Park is part of the El Centro Field Office, managed under the Eastern San Diego County Management Framework Plan. This plan is currently being amended and covers approximately 98,000 acres of public lands including wilderness areas and numerous hiking and equestrian opportunities. The area has existing camping facilities and staging areas for the trails within its jurisdiction.

Although the BLM is not currently active in creating trails, they are open to providing trail easements or having trails within their lands. This would be done on a case-by-case basis. They would like to make as many of the trails multi-use as possible. They also would like to explore ways to share the financial burden of maintenance, enforcement, and operations. The BLM would be a willing partner with the County in future trail planning.

As noted earlier, the state and federal parklands currently have an extensive trail system (when combined, over 863 miles of trails) that is available to county residents (see Figure 2-4). This in itself is a significant opportunity and resource. The County does not have to contribute to the costs associated with the maintenance and management of these trails. The trail system in these public lands has the potential to form connections to the adjacent existing county trails or even future trails. These connections could ultimately make any future County Regional Trail network system more meaningful and useful.

Another positive feature is that some of these public lands currently provide the necessary staging areas for trail heads that could be used to access trails that lead to adjacent trails outside the park areas.

Providing for future trails that link state and federal parks and other public lands would be a positive step towards trail connectivity. It could also expand the existing trail system to other significant public places (parks, historical monuments, cultural resources, scenic areas).

In general, providing for trails on public lands could also have a positive cost benefit. The cost for trail improvements/implementation could be lower since land acquisition costs may not be required. Also, maintenance and operations costs could be shared when multiple agencies are involved with the trail system.

Constraints

Construction and maintenance of new trails in the more remote parts of the county could increase the cost for implementation and maintenance. Additionally, there are limited public lands in the western and more urbanized areas of the county for the construction of future trails. Developing multi-agency partnerships would take time and require a significant effort for coordination and administration.

Semi-public Lands

There are a variety of semi-public lands within San Diego County. The ones described here could have the most effect on the success of future trails.

Utility Easements (electric, cable, gas, water/sewer)

Opportunity

Utility easements tend to be interconnected strips of land that could form links to existing trails or parks where trails occur. These easement areas are considered disturbed and typically lack the sensitive biological and cultural resources that would inhibit their use for trails.

San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E). SDG&E has numerous utility easements throughout the county. Some of these easements are currently used for trails. Trails crossing perpendicular to the easements are not an issue, it is when the trail runs longitudinally within the easement. The two main areas of concern for SDG&E are operation and liability. The operational problem is when hikers, bikers and equestrians are on the trail the same time the utility trucks are servicing

the lines. The trail users' presence sometimes hinders the service men from performing their duties. SDG&E would like the option of being able to close the trails when they are in the field servicing their lines, but realize this is typically not possible.

The other issue is liability, especially with equestrians. Horses not accustomed to maintenance vehicles have been "spooked" and gone off the trail. If the easement is dedicated as a trail the liability protection is different than if it simply remains as an easement. There is a civil code (public property law) that protects SDG&E when easements, although used as trails, remain identified simply as easements.

SDG&E will always "come to the table" when they have received a request to use their easements. They will review each different proposal to determine if the requested use of the easement will be compatible with their current operations and how best to address the issue of liability. SDG&E is currently working with the developer Trimark in the South Bay (Chula Vista), where they are providing a dual trail. The second trail would be used when service vehicles are in the field.

Constraints

Obtaining permits from utility companies, and permission or easements from landowners can be difficult. There is also the potential use associated with utility easements that would be incompatible with trails. The County of San Diego Sanitation and Sewers Department identified why they typically restrict public use for easements. The first is vandalism, including pipes being clogged with debris such as rocks and vegetation. Also, above ground pipelines have been shot at and penetrated by firearms. Secondly, the easements are typically on private lands and already have restricted uses.

Water Districts

Opportunity

Many of the County water districts have open space areas associated with their reservoirs. These include a variety of recreational uses that allow for hiking trails (see Appendix N). It should be noted that the primary role for any water authority is to provide and maintain a clean source of potable water for its clients. Recreation uses at these reservoir sites are only allowed as long as they do not interfere with this primary objective. Some of the reservoirs are in urban areas, so linking the lakes and associated recreational facilities with trails would be beneficial to local residents. Samples of different water district's programs are provided below.

City of San Diego Water Utilities Department. The San Diego Water Utilities Department has numerous reservoirs under its management. As shown in Appendix N, most provide recreational opportunities that include hiking trails. There are no specific policies that either encourage or prohibit offsite trails from connecting to their recreation areas. Offsite trails would have to be accessed through the reservoir's current controlled points. Offsite trails could not access the reservoir trails from a point, which is not controlled or supervised by the water district.

As development encroaches closer to the rural reservoirs the Utility Department will provide recreational opportunities that would include trails similar to Lake Murray and Miramar Lake. An example of this is Lower Otay Lake. Currently no trails are in place at Lower Otay Lake, but some planning is being done in anticipation of future needs. The San Diego City Lake Development Plan has been prepared but it has not been implemented. This plan addresses issues such as trails and the availability of trails for public use.

Olivenhain Municipal Water District: The Elfin Forest Recreation Reserve is part of the District reservoir project off of Harmony Grove Road. The reserve is approximately 850 acres in size with most of that area being devoted to the reservoir. When the reservoir is complete (winter 2003) the reserve will have 20 plus miles of multi-use trails. The multi-use trails would include additional equestrian use.

There are no specific policies directed towards offsite trails connecting to their recreation areas. The district's initial request would be to limit offsite trail access to their designated trailheads. One offsite trail advantage the district did see was the possibility of connecting their recreational trails to Lake Hodges. The District would also be interested in being connected to a Regional Trail System. Existing trailhead or staging facilities are limited and currently provide the minimum parking to service their needs.

Otay Water District. Most of the facilities are pipes and tanks. The district has only one public trail within its boundary. This is a 30 foot wide easement in the Rolling Hills Ranch project. The District does allow for encroachments into the easements but it does not specify the type (i.e. trails) of encroachment allowed. Encroachments are allowed if they do not interfere with the operations, maintenance, repair or replacement of the systems (see Appendix N).

San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA). The SDCWA currently does not have policies specifically directed toward trails. SDCWA property around Sweetwater reservoir allows for equestrian trails. The City of Poway, SDCWA, and a developer created an agreement that allows for trails and connections through Bridal Woods Estates.

Most trail requests are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. . Typically the SDCWA easements are on private property and SDCWA does not have the right to grant access to these easements. SDCWA only owns about 5 percent of the lands on which they operate. An easement access request can be made (see Appendix O). The Authority has entered into agreements in the past with the County of San Diego. The example shown in Appendix O was for an equestrian-only trail.

Constraints

The majority of the reservoirs in San Diego County are for pedestrians only and do not allow equestrian uses. Since most of the trails are within close proximity to the water source, the districts are concerned that horse fecal matter could contaminate the water supply. However, there are a few exceptions to this policy as noted above in Bridal Woods Estates. The other exceptions are Lake Poway, Lake Cuyamaca and Lake Morena.

Access is another issue that might present a constraint when trying to connect future trails with other district's recreation areas. As County trails are planned there may be better locations to connect to the reservoir trails and facilities than at the reservoir's existing control point.

Developing multi-agency partnerships would take time and require a significant effort for coordination and administration.

Sanitation Districts

Opportunity

Closed landfills typically end up as open space with limited use. All closed landfills that were owned by the County were sold to Pacific Waste Service in 1997. Pacific Waste policy regarding possible trail opportunities is not known, as they did not respond during the research process.

Constraints

The primary limitation to placing trails within Sanitation Districts is the potential for methane gas escaping from the landfills. Trails could be located along the edge of the landfills as long as they do not disturb the landfill cap.

The only landfill operated by the City of San Diego is the Miramar Landfill, which is still in operation.

Caltrans

Opportunity

Currently Caltrans allows for people to walk along the shoulder of a highway but not along a freeway. It is possible for a trail or pathway along a state highway to be developed. The only applicable design guideline by Caltrans pertains to bike trails, which are included in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual (see Appendix P).

Constraints

The right of way for highways is typically limited in width. Any provision for a trail or pathway may require additional right-of-way. Physical limitations may include cut slopes and steep terrain that would minimize the ability to add to the right-of-way for future pathways. Pedestrians cannot use the rights-of-way for freeways.

Indian Reservations

Opportunity

There are 18 Indian Reservations in San Diego County. Many of the reservations are in the more rural areas of the county and are not significantly developed. Also, some of the reservations are adjacent to federal parks, state parks and open space preserves. This close proximity to public lands could provide potential opportunity for connecting to existing and proposed trails.

Constraints

Of the three reservations contacted (Pala, Santa Ysabel and Viejas Reservations) none have policies that would allow for trails on their reservation. At this point their tribal council does not allow for the public to trespass onto the reservations. It is highly probable that trail use on reservations would not be currently allowed by any of the local tribes.

Conclusions

Private Lands

A Countywide Trail Plan that identifies routes across or adjacent to private lands must address the cost, land-use, privacy, liability, and the “due process” issues that concern many of San Diego County landowners. This will be true whether the lands in question remain in private

ownership or are eventually obtained by a public agency such as the County. Many of these concerns can be addressed at the detailed phase of planning and design and include:

- \$ fencing and barrier plantings that discourage trespassing;
- \$ signage;
- \$ scheduled maintenance and patrols; and
- \$ indemnity agreements (already possible under current County ordinance) to protect the landowners from liability for injuries to trail users.

Therefore, the property owner's concern will extend to how the trail alignment, design, operations and management will be handled. The affected landowner will have an interest in participating in that process. This is understandable since they will experience the outcome of this effort on a day-to-day basis.

The Board has stated on numerous occasions their support for the rights of property owners. However, that has also been tempered with the recognition that trails are a needed element for the County of San Diego residents. If the County is to acquire private lands, they should notify landowners in the unincorporated areas whose properties may be affected by future trail routes. The landowners should be informed as soon as possible to determine their level of interest to participate and to be able to voice any concerns they may have.

If the opportunity for acquiring private lands for trail easements were eliminated, the available options for implementing a Trail Plan would be limited (See Figure 3-3). This would make it more difficult to construct a significant trail system within the county.

As private development continues to occur in the county it is important that the County prepare a Trail Master Plan to insure that future trail opportunities are not eliminated. With no current Trail Plan provided by the County, opportunities for trail implementation may become increasingly limited. As critical properties go forward for development, and no trail easements are provided, the ability to establish a cohesive trail system is less likely to occur.

Public Lands

Most of the public land ownerships have policies that would allow for the implementation of trails connections to their existing trails. This is the case with USFS, CDPR, and BLM. Most of these agencies are in the process of updating or preparing management plans for their respective areas.

The County should make every effort to coordinate with these public agencies on future trail locations and to interconnect with planned trails and facilities. Providing trail connections to these existing facilities would benefit any trail system proposed by the County. Forming some type of multi-jurisdictional agencies to look at shared opportunities should be pursued.

Also, the BLM would like to look for opportunities to share in the cost of maintaining and operating trails and the necessary support facilities such as signage. The sharing of costs associated with trails will probably be a point of discussion with all public agencies.

Semi-Public Lands

There are a variety of semi-public landowners. Each have their own methods of providing access to their lands or associated easements. Most have no specific policies that are directed toward trails. Any discussions regarding trail access or easements would require direct contact on a case-by-case basis with the specific parties. The landowners with associated recreational facilities would probably be the most willing to participate. These owners would probably see an advantage in having trails connect to their recreational facilities from the surrounding community. Any trail alignments must consider the entity with which it will be dealing and prepare a strategy to obtain access agreements.

3.2.2 Land Use

Recreational Uses

Opportunity

In San Diego County there are numerous parks, most of which have a trail system as part of their own recreational component. In the County of San Diego there are 17 regional parks, 3 sports parks and 22 community parks. In addition to these parks there are 14 open space preserves. All of the regional parks and the open space preserves provide for trails. The only regional parks that do not have trails are El Monte and Pine Valley. All of these parks are currently utilized by many of the county residents and could provide trail connections or trail heads to any future trails that would be located beyond the boundaries of the park. Having the trailheads with the existing park can also enhance the trail experience more than a trailhead that would share a parking lot with a school or other similar type facility.

Existing support facilities such as parking, restrooms, and water are often already established at the parks and therefore could be used as staging areas. Because of this, the associated

Figure 3-3 Future Trail Connects on Private Lands (8 ½ x 11)

This page intentionally left blank

construction costs of the new trailheads could be minimized. Also, having the park as a destination point for a trailhead/staging area would not impact other land use areas that might be needed to access the trails.

Constraints

Consideration should be given to the park's current activities and how well it would be able to function as a trailhead or staging area. Some forms of recreation uses and trail users could be incompatible. An example of this might be an equestrian staging area mixing with other high activity sports such as baseball or soccer. Overuse at certain parks could occur if there are not sufficient improvements made to accommodate the new uses. This is particularly important with to parking. Certain parks may need to enhance their existing facility simply to function as a trailhead or staging area.

Educational Institutions

Opportunity

In general, educational institutions such as schools could provide staging areas for trailheads. The ability to have shared weekend use of existing parking areas could benefit trail users without significant additional cost to the County. Also, the trails could be used as an "outdoor" classroom or as part of a school nature program.

Of the five School Districts contacted (Alpine, Borrego, Bonsall, Jamul-Dulzura, and Valley Center/Pala), the following items were identified:

Opportunities for future trails to connect from schools to residential areas should be considered. The ability for students to commute to school on trails, separated from automobile traffic, is a positive feature from the School District standpoint. The School District currently has Joint Use Agreements or Joint Power Authority (JPA) with the County for recreational facilities. These same types of agreements could be used when proposing to use certain schools for trail staging areas.

Most School Districts consider themselves a part of the community. As such, they want to work with and support the needs of communities. However, it must be demonstrated that providing trailheads or trail access is a benefit to the School District. This benefit needs to be identified before the School District even considers entering into a Joint Use Agreement. Each School District will have specific objectives and issues that will need to be addressed at the time the trail

is planned. However, if the community at large is not supportive of trails, it is quite possible that the trail would not be supported by the School District.

Constraints

There may be liability issues associated with the shared use, and using the area for trailhead staging may conflict with the weekday use of the existing school facility. This could limit the weekday use of the trail from certain locations.

Safety is another issue. The School District would not want the general public to have access to school properties and would require restricted access during school hours. An alternative is to have the trail end near or adjacent to the school in a more public or visible area.

Another concern with a Joint Use Agreement would be the litter left by trail users at the trailheads. This is currently a problem with the recreational facilities that are used after school hours or on weekends. Proper facilities should be provided at the trailhead to eliminate this problem. At first glance, equestrian staging areas would not be permitted on school properties.

Timing is also an issue. Any discussion or negotiations with the School District will involve state authorities. This can be a lengthy procedure. If the County wants to look into these options, discussion should start at the earliest time possible.

Residential Uses

Opportunity

Trails that are close to residential areas would minimize the travel time for residents in getting to trails or trailheads. Close-to-home opportunities should be a priority. It would also be an added benefit by potentially having a higher level or more frequent use of the trails. This increases the overall benefits of having trails within urban areas and potentially increases the value of the adjacent properties. As new residential communities are developed, trail opportunities should be reviewed.

Constraints

It may be difficult to implement new trails in existing urbanized areas where public lands are scarce and extensive purchase of private lands would be required. The cost for purchase of usable private lands for trail use could be prohibitive. This is especially true in the San Diego

region, as the price for real estate is significantly higher than many other parts of California and the United States.

Also, because the trails are within close proximity to residences it will be critical where the trails are located, how they are designed and maintained. An additional issue will be how the trails affect the potential loss of privacy if they are not designed correctly.

Military Installations

Opportunity

Typically military bases have large undeveloped open space areas with the “potential” to allow connections to regional or even community trails. One example can be seen at Miramar Air Station, where the southeastern edge of the military base is adjacent to Mission Trails Regional Park and the southwestern edge is adjacent to Sycamore Regional Park. A major opportunity would be to provide a trail link from the community of Scripps Miramar Ranch to either one of these areas and to the other trails beyond. To make this connection it would require an access easement through the Air Station.

Constraints

Safety and security issues for both the military and the trail users are major concerns. Trail access or easements have potential conflicts with military mission statements and are generally not allowed. Also, the bases have critical habitat areas that limit the access possibilities.

Currently Camp Pendleton allows access to the base only from existing roads and paths. All other areas are restricted and off limits. Miramar Air Station currently has no public trails identified. Discussion with either of the military bases regarding public trails within the bases would be lengthy and obtaining access to the base would possibly be difficult to achieve.

Industrial Uses

Opportunity

Industrial areas, particularly light industrial (office, research and development, light manufacturing), could provide staging areas for trailheads. If these types of industrial uses are located near future or even existing trails, they could provide shared weekend use of existing parking facilities. This would provide access to the trails and would benefit trail users without additional significant cost to the County. Also, employees could use the trails for lunchtime

exercise. Opportunities for future trails to connect from residential areas to employment areas should always be considered. The trails could then be used by employees to commute to work. Alternative funding sources could be looked at for development of trails related to commuting.

Constraints

There may be liability issues associated with the shared use, and using the area for trailhead staging may conflict with the weekday use of the existing facility. This could limit the weekday use of the trail.

Conclusions

Recreation Uses

When analyzing the location of future trails the County should take into account where existing recreational facilities are located. Making a connection to these facilities can make parks a destination and increase use of the trails. The connection to recreation areas would be even more beneficial if the proposed trails were near residential areas. These trails could provide alternative access to the recreation areas thereby minimizing use of automobiles. The County should determine if the existing recreation facilities could provide staging areas or trailheads providing access to future trails. Linking recreation areas with Regional and/or Community Trails should be a major consideration and goal.

Educational Institutions

Providing trail links or connections to schools should be a major consideration when trail routes are being studied. Safe routes for children to commute to school should be a high priority. Providing trails may be one option to satisfy this goal. The County should also explore the possibility of schools providing the opportunity for potential trailheads.

Residential Uses

Close-to-home trails provide the best opportunities for residents to use trails on a daily basis. Providing trails is considered a major benefit and enhances the livability of residential areas. Implementing future trails near or in residential areas should be a priority in any County Trail Program. The County should review trail priorities with each of the communities and allow for a “bottom up” approach to trail planning.

Military Installations

It will be very difficult to try and include military bases into any future Trail Program. It may be best to completely avoid the bases and look for alternative trail alignments or routes. If a particular alignment (perhaps a regional trail) absolutely needs to go through a military base, discussion should begin immediately to determine the possibility.

Industrial Uses

The County should look for every opportunity to expand the trail system to include existing and future industrial areas or any employment areas. This can be done at the regional or community level. The County should also explore the opportunities for developing a Joint Use Agreement with property owners for possible use of parking facilities for staging areas or trailheads.

3.2.3 Environmental Issues

Numerous environmental issues will need to be considered when addressing trail location and implementation. Below is a summary of the primary environmental issues that could impact or constrain trail alignments and configurations, as future trail studies are prepared. A list of opportunities that could enhance the trail experience is also provided.

An overview of selected environmental constraints such as geologic faults, sensitive biological resources, critical habitat, and the 100-year floodplain are illustrated in Figure 3-4 and Figure 3-5.

Biological Sensitive Lands

Resource Conservation Areas (RCA)

Opportunity

Adding trails through RCAs could provide linkage to existing trails. Sensitive designed public access to RCAs can expand public awareness and encourage conservation of these areas. Trails in RCAs could provide the opportunity for biological resource education programs that could enhance the experience for trail users.

Constraints

Requirements for protection and preservation of sensitive resources could involve lengthy processing time, and mitigation costs. Trail use could cause disturbance of the natural areas due to human intrusion. The addition of trails in RCAs may conflict with adopted plans, policies, and RCA designation in some cases.

Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP)

Opportunity

The MSCP allows for passive recreation uses and this includes trails. Locating trails within the MSCP could provide linkage to existing trails. Trails within the MSCP could provide the opportunity for biological resource education programs on the success of this innovative preservation program. This would enhance the trails\ experience by increasing the public's appreciation of the natural settings and could ensure public support for long-term preservation.

Constraints

Requirements for protection and preservation of sensitive resources could pose limitations. Due to the sensitivity of these areas, approval of trails in MCSP areas could involve lengthy processing time and mitigation costs.

Trails within the MSCP lands may be required to close during certain times of the year due to breeding of endangered species or other sensitive biological issues. Alternative routes may be possible in these areas in order for the trail to still function. However, this will depend on any environmental constraints the alternative trail would have within the area.

Figure 3-4 Environmental Constraints Map (11x17)

Back page of Figure 3-4

Figure 3-5 Environmental Constraints Map (11x17)

Back page of Figure 3-5

Wetlands/Riparian Woodlands

Opportunity

Trails within the wetlands/riparian woodlands could provide education programs and enhance the experience for trail users. These areas could increase appreciation of the natural settings and the ecological significance that wetland/riparian areas provide and could also ensure long-term preservation.

Constraints

Requirements for protection and preservation of sensitive resources could involve expensive mitigation costs and lengthy processing time under the Clean Water Act with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Section 404) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Section 401). Increased human activity may degrade adjacent areas that were previously inaccessible. The addition of trails may conflict with adopted plans and policies and state or federal regulations.

Sensitive Species

Opportunity

Areas inhabited by sensitive species could provide the opportunity for biological resource education programs and enhance the trail experience. Increased appreciation of sensitive species and their situation could ensure long-term preservation.

Constraints

Requirements for protection and preservation of sensitive resources involve expensive mitigation costs and lengthy processing time through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game. Disturbance to wildlife corridors due to increased human activity may degrade habitat linkages and could indirectly affect the sensitive species. Proposed trails may conflict with adopted plans and policies.

Critical Habitat

Opportunity

Trails located within the critical habitat could provide linkage to existing trails. These trails could provide critical habitat education programs and enhance the experience for the trail users.

Increased appreciation of these habitats and public understanding of their significance to the continued survival of the species could help to ensure long-term preservation.

Constraints

Requirements for protection and preservation of these highly sensitive resources involve lengthy processing time, and substantial mitigation costs if the project includes federal funding or involvement. Proposed trails may conflict with adopted plans and policies.

Hazardous Materials

Opportunity

Remediated sites (i.e. closed landfill site), depending on their previous uses, could be used for passive recreational uses such as trails to connect to existing trail systems.

Constraints

There are many liability issues regarding public health and safety. Trails have significant potential conflicts with current hazardous materials operations.

Steep Topography

Opportunity

In areas where steep topography exists there is the potential for expansive views and enhanced trail experience.

Constraints

Trail use could increase erosion unless “Best Management Practices” are included. Trails could be difficult to traverse and be in conflict with ADA accessibility standards. Steep topography could increase health and safety liabilities. There are conflicts with adopted plans and policies. It may be difficult and expensive to construct and maintain trails.

Watershed Lands/Water Quality

Opportunity

Trails have typically been provided within rivers or streambeds. These areas usually form long distance corridors and are undeveloped providing unique trail experiences. The watersheds naturally form links and opportunities to provide connections within existing natural systems. Sensitively designed public access to creeks, rivers, and other waterways can expand public awareness and encourage conservation of these areas.

Constraints

Sensitive habitat areas could pose limitations and design standards could be difficult to enforce once lands become encroached. An increase in erosion could affect water quality unless “Best Management Practices” are included. There could be potential mitigation costs due to biological impacts.

Flood Plain Land/Drainages

Opportunity

Flood plains naturally form links and opportunities to provide connections within existing natural systems. Sensitively designed public access to creeks, rivers, and other waterways can expand public awareness and encourage conservation of these areas.

Constraints

Sensitive habitat areas could pose limitations and design standards could be difficult to enforce once encroachment occurs. An increase in erosion could affect water quality unless “Best Management Practices” are included. There could be potential mitigation costs. There are conflicts with adopted plans and policies.

Aesthetics

Opportunity

Wilderness and rural trails could provide the opportunity for a more aesthetic trail experience.

Constraints

The construction of trails in urban areas may not provide the aesthetic value normally associated with a trail system.

Wildland Fire Management

Opportunity

Trails could increase public health and safety by providing firebreaks, and emergency access. The firebreaks should be established during the planning and development process.

Constraints

Increased user activity could increase the risk of wildfires. High fuel load vegetation areas should be avoided.

Cultural Resources

Opportunity

Cultural resources could be included in the trail experience to provide education programs and to enhance the variety of the trail experience. Trail access to these resources could increase the protection as well.

Constraints

Disturbance or destruction of sensitive cultural resources would reduce our knowledge of the history of the San Diego area and would be inconsistent with state and federal cultural resource regulations. Native American resources could be impacted. Sensitive design standards would be necessary, and surveys would need to be conducted prior to trail construction. Mitigation measures may be required.

Conclusions

When the County is establishing or implementing a Trail Plan it should avoid significant environmental impacts. This avoidance would reduce the overall processing time and the cost of mitigation. The following goals would minimize the environmental processing timelines and level of mitigation:

-
- \$ Avoid impacts to sensitive biological resources such as wetland/riparian areas, critical habitat, and sensitive species.
 - \$ Avoid use of unremediated hazardous waste sites.
 - \$ Avoid use of areas with steep topography.
 - \$ Avoid areas that may increase erosion and impact water quality.
 - \$ Avoid flood plain areas that may not be compatible with adopted plans and policies.
 - \$ Avoid impacts to prehistoric and historic cultural resource sites and to sensitive Native American sites.
 - \$ Avoid trail use of areas determined to include high fuel loads that would increase the risk of wildfires.

3.2.4 Environmental Approaches and Process Summary

The County's Trail System project would be subject to state and potentially federal environmental regulations prior to implementation. The County Trail Opportunities and Constraints chapter of this document would be used as an initial foundation for the subsequent environmental review process by identifying any environmental constraints that could affect implementation of the proposed project.

Planning Documents

At the state level, trail projects are subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (14 California Code of Regulations 15000 et seq.). CEQA requires that the project be analyzed to determine potential environmental effects, or impacts, that could result should the project be implemented. Environmental analysis conducted under CEQA could take one of three formats, depending on the severity of impacts and the complexity of the project. The simplest analysis for a project is a categorical exemption. A trail project could be a categorical exempt project if there were no identified significant environmental impacts associated with its implementation and certain limitation and exceptions are met. However, these types of projects would be uncommon.

The next level of analysis would be an Initial Study (IS) that could lead to approval of a Negative Declaration, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an Environmental Impact Report. The IS includes a checklist in which the project's likely impacts are analyzed in the following areas: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning (including recreation), noise and vibration, population and housing, public services, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems. If, during the environmental review process, the County determines that no

significant environmental impacts would result from the project, or mitigation measures are available that would reduce any potentially significant impacts to below levels of significance; the County may adopt a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project. This process would be expected to take approximately four to six months or longer due to special studies needed to make determination of no significant impacts. The document would be required to be made available to governmental agencies and members of the public for review.

If the County determines that significant impacts may result from the project, then an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would be required. To begin the EIR process the County would publish a Notice of Preparation (NOP) describing the project to be analyzed and the potential environmental impacts. Members of the public and governmental entities would have the opportunity to comment on the range of issues and the scope of the EIR during at least a 30-day public review period. After the NOP review period, a Draft EIR would be prepared. The Draft EIR would describe the existing environmental conditions and would assess the potential consequences of implementation of the proposed project. The Draft EIR would be available to the public for at least a 45-day public review period. The County would be responsible for preparing a Final EIR and for responding to public comments in the Final EIR. If the project results in significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, the agency must prepare a Statement of Overriding Considerations detailing the specific economic, social, legal, technical, or other reasons that make the mitigation measures infeasible. The EIR process would last 10 to 14 months.

Citations and conformance issues with environmentally related ordinance and policies and plan are briefly discussed here.

Resource Protection Ordinance

The Resource Protection Ordinance is designed to enhance the preservation of the County's wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, sensitive biological habitats, and prehistoric and historic sites. As a discretionary project, under this Ordinance, the County Trail System would be required to prepare a Resource Protection Study to ensure the protection of sensitive lands and prevent their degradation and loss.

Recreational uses and access paths are allowed within wetlands and wetland buffer areas provided they do not harm the natural ecosystem. Recreational uses are allowed in the floodways and floodplain fringe provided that no use will substantially harm the environmental values of a particular floodway area. Trails for passive recreational use are allowed in areas of steep slope provided they are in accordance with approved park plans. Trail development within the sensitive habitat lands may be allowed when feasible measures necessary to protect and preserve

the sensitive habitat lands or if they were required as a condition of permit approval and were mitigation measures. In addition, an equal or greater benefit to the affected species would need to be provided. Trails would only be allowed in significant prehistoric or historic sites with an approved research design program prepared by an archaeologist of the Registry of Professional Archaeologists.

Multiple Species Conservation Program

The Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) is a subregional plan under the Natural Communities Conservation Program, which is implemented through local Subarea Plans. The MSCP is intended to address the needs of multiple species and the preservation of vegetation communities in San Diego County. Recreational activities, including trails, are allowed in the MSCP provided they are in concurrence with the goals of the MSCP and County Subarea Plans. Any portions of the proposed County Trail System that is within the County Subarea Plan of the MSCP must be in conformance with the MSCP Plan and the Subarea Plan.

Biological Mitigation Ordinance

The Biological Mitigation Ordinance is a component of the MSCP and is intended to protect the County's biological resources and prevent their degradation and loss by guiding development outside of biological resource core areas, and by establishing mitigation standards. This Ordinance applies to all land within the San Diego County MSCP Boundary. As a discretionary project, the Biological Mitigation Ordinance would apply to the proposed County Trail System, and consistency with the ordinance would be required.

California Department of Fish and Game Streambed Alteration Agreement

Application for a streambed alteration agreement is required for all construction impacts to streambeds and other wetland habitats associated with streams and lakes per Section 1601 and 1603 of the California Fish and Game Code. These sections of the Fish and Game Code are designed to manage impacts to critical aquatic and semi-aquatic resources. If the proposed County Trail System would adversely affect existing fish or wildlife resources, California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) would require mitigation on a case-by-case basis.

Endangered Species Act

Any project construction activities, including trails, that may affect federal or state listed rare, threatened, or endangered species would require consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) under Section 7 of the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) and with the

CDFG pursuant to Section 2081 of the State Fish and Game Code. Avoidance of listed species is the preferred approach; however, if impacts cannot be avoided consultation with the regulatory agencies would be required.

Habitat Loss Permit

A determination is required that any proposed trail projects constructed are consistent with the Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS) Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) Process Guidelines (CDFG, November 1993) or any approved subregional mitigation guidelines. The County would issue a Habitat Loss Permit prior to the grading of any area with coastal sage scrub habitat in conjunction with the County's approved MSCP program. Concurrence would be required from the USFWS and CDFG with regard to the loss coastal sage scrub habitat.

Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act (CWA), Section 404 is administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), and addresses the placement of dredged or fill materials into wetland and jurisdictional waterways. A Section 404 permit would be required for any trail construction associated with the proposed County Trail Program that would impact riparian habitat, streambeds, vernal pools, and other wetland and non-wetland waterways. There is no minimum threshold requirement of an ACOE permit where there is federal jurisdiction of a waterway and type of activity; however, a number of nationwide permits may be appropriately utilized to minimize permitting requirements. If a nationwide permit does not apply, however, an individual permit must be obtained.

Water Quality

The San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) issues the Clean Water Act, Section 401, Water Quality Certification or waiver. The certification or waiver is part of the approval process for impacts to wetlands and jurisdiction of waterways under the federal regulation of the ACOE, and is a required element of approval and processing of a Section 404 permit. A Section 401 waiver provides the State some oversight authority with respect to the implementation of federal actions within State waters.

Implementation Issues

The environmental document(s) will determine the need for special implementation measures for the proposed trail system. These special needs would be documented in the form of mitigation

measures identified in the mitigation monitoring and reporting program. Mitigation and permitting are discussed in more detail below.

Environmental compliance of the mitigation measures could be required as part of the project approval process. This effort would ensure the project is implemented in the same way in which the environmental document(s) intended. The environmental compliance could include the use of biological and cultural resource monitors during implementation of proposed trail improvements. Other compliance efforts that could be required during project construction could include monitoring for noise, erosion control, downstream sedimentation, water quality, and dust control.

Mitigation and Permitting

In addition, other approvals and permits may be required for implementation of the County's Trail System project because certain state and federal statutes are applicable under certain circumstances. Table 3-1 lists the federal and state permits/actions that may be required and identifies the agencies that may use the information to make decisions regarding issuance of permits or approvals.

Although the mitigation measures and required permits would be identified during the environmental process, many of the mitigation measures could be implemented, and the permits could be obtained, after finalization and approval of the environmental document. For example, the Conditions of Approval for the environmental documents could require obtaining a Section 404 permit under the Clean Water Act prior to the start of project construction. Once the environmental document has been approved, construction of the project could begin. In certain instances, completion of required mitigation measures could occur during and after construction of the project.

Comparisons

All other municipalities in California would be required to comply with the same federal and state environmental regulations as the environmental approach described in this document. The difference would be in the level of specificity of the project, i.e., whether it would be processed as a General Plan Element, Master Trail Plan, or an individual Community Trail Plan.

Table 3-1.
Permits or Actions Potentially Required to Implement Proposed Trail Projects:

Act	Regulatory Agency	Resources	Permit or Statue	Timeline
Clean Water Act	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Wetlands and Waters of the U.S.	Section 404	6 Months
Clean Water Act	Regional Water Quality Control Board	Water Quality	Section 401	6 Months
Clean Air Act	San Diego Air Pollution Control District	Air Quality	Conformance with State Implementation Plan/Air Quality Management Plan	3 Months
Federal Endangered Species Act	Department of the Interior - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS)	Threatened and Endangered Species	Section 7 consultation.	8 Months
State Endangered Species Act	California Department of Fish and Game	Threatened and Endangered Species, and Special Status Species	Section 2081 of the Fish and Game Code	8-18 Months
Stream Bed Alteration Agreement	California Department of Fish and Game	Stream Beds	Section 1601 of the Fish and Game Code	2-3 Months
Multiple Species Conservation Program/ Biological Mitigation Ordinance	County of San Diego	Biological	Conformance with MSCP guidelines/ may be exempt from Biological Mitigation Ordinance if findings apply	As needed to coordinate with County Staff
National Historic Preservation Act	State Historic Preservation Officer	Prehistoric and Historic	SHPO Concurrence	3 Months
Resource Protection Ordinance	County of San Diego	Wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, biological habitats, prehistoric and historic sites	Resource Protection Study	Concurrent with discretionary approval
Natural Community Conservation Planning Guidelines/ County Code	County of San Diego	Diegan coastal sage scrub	Habitat Loss Permit	Concurrent with ministerial grading and clearing permits and improvement plans

3.2.5 Other Issues

Existing Trail Easements

Opportunity

There are currently a number of trail easements (See Figure 3-6) that have been provided to the County for future implementation of trails. These lands designated for trails could be utilized to link established or future trails in individual community planning areas.

Constraints

Some of the easements may be difficult to access or may be unsuitable for development as trails. The easements are also displaced over numerous areas and disconnected and it may be difficult to physically join the easements together or connect them to a future trail network.

Other Easements

Opportunity

There may be some potential for trails in easements that exist, such as those provided for open space dedications. There may be potential for modifying these easements to include trail connections. Although these easements were established for other purposes, they may represent opportunities for trail connections through private lands where no other options exist.

Constraints

Modification of existing approved final maps to allow for trails may be necessary. Coordination would be necessary in order to determine the legal and physical feasibility of these other easements to be utilized for trail purposes. The original use of the easement would take precedence and would need to be evaluated for potential compatibility.

Existing County Roads (Rights-of-way)

Opportunity

Pathways associated with road rights-of-way through rural portions of the county have the potential to provide necessary connections between some communities and existing trails in outlying parks or region. Pathways also provide a transportation alternative as they follow

existing roads that would typically connect to local community facilities. Since an existing public right-of-way is already provided, legal access has been established. Costs associated with pathway improvements could be funded with road improvements or other types of transportation funds.

Constraints

Existing right-of-way widths may not easily accommodate a designated area for a continuous trail or pathway. The construction costs could be prohibitive when expanding the right of way width related to land use, topography, the need to accommodate utilities, or other physical constraints.

There may also be conflicts when utility companies need to make repairs within the right-of-way that would require the closure or rerouting of the pathway. Noise from traffic should also be considered as it may inhibit equestrian users. The pathway would typically have a lessened aesthetic, scenic value or trail experience when compared to that of a more rural trail.

Community Planning and Sponsor Groups

Opportunity

The majority of the Community Planning and Sponsor Groups have expressed an interest to participate in establishing trails within their communities (Chapter 2.2.5). This type of support will further enhance the opportunity to complete a regional as well as a community wide trail system. Early participation by the community and sponsor groups also provides insight into where trails could be located within each community. Each participating group provided a trail map illustrating possible trail routes in their community. These maps are provided in Appendix G. Further discussion on the level of community planning and sponsor groups' involvement is discussed in Chapter 2.

The numerous surveys conducted during this study also showed a desire for trails by the general population. Although those surveyed are not part of an organized community group they do represent a portion of the community at large. This type of positive response reinforces the level of community support for trails that will only be helpful in the future.

Another positive opportunity within the community is the number of well-organized trail groups within the existing Community Planning areas. To date these organizations have been largely responsible for maintaining the existing trails and instrumental in creating new ones. Without

Figure 3-6 Trail Easements (11x17)

Back side of Figure 3-6

this effort and support by the trail organizations many of the current trails would not exist. Continued support by the trail groups will greatly enhance the existing and future trails.

Constraints

A few of the Community Planning and Sponsor Groups have expressed little or no interest in wanting trails or even a willingness to participate in the trail planning process. This unwillingness to participate could create temporary voids in trail locations where trails are needed but there may not be sufficient community support to initiate or implement proposed trails.

Existing Trails (federal, state, county, and local city wide)

Opportunity

There are numerous existing trails within the county that are part of federal, state, and incorporated lands. As stated earlier these are critical in providing the variety of trail opportunities and trail experiences for the county residents.

Federal Lands

There are numerous trail opportunities within federal lands. These include trails located within the Cleveland National Forest and also the Pacific Crest Trail, which is under federal management. The BLM (see section 3.2.1) also provides trails, although somewhat more limited than USFS.

State of California Department of Parks and Recreation

The State of California has a recreation Trail Program that is defined in the Public Resource Code. The trails that are part of this State Policy that effect San Diego County include:

- \$ San Diego-Anza Borrego Desert – This trail is to travel from Oceanside, through the San Luis Rey River Valley to the California Desert Corridor in the Anza Borrego Desert. The State allows the local jurisdiction to dictate when they would want to initiate these statewide trails. To date no local jurisdiction, including the County, has initiated the planning or mapping of this trail.
- \$ The Pacific Coast Trail – This trail runs along the coast and is partially developed in the northern part of the county from Camp Pendleton to the city of Oceanside.

\$ South Coast Range Trail - This trail has long been noted in the California Statewide Trails Plan but little effort has been done towards planning and implementing this trail by the State. The State allows the local jurisdiction to dictate when they would want to initiate these statewide trails. To date no local jurisdiction, including the County, has initiated the planning or mapping of this trail.

A map illustrating these trails general alignment is included in Appendix H. In addition to these proposed and existing trails there are numerous trails located in the Rancho Cuyamaca and the Anza Borrego State Parks (see section 3.2.1.). The State is concerned about the possible loss of segments of the California Riding and Hiking Trail. The loss of these segments is due to the easements on private lands being eliminated and also the lack of sufficient funds for continued maintenance.

County of San Diego Park and Recreation Department

The existing trails within County parks and open space preserves could possibly be connected to a Regional Trail System adding to the variety of trail opportunities in the county. Additionally, the County has a network of existing trails that could be connected to many of the state and federal trails. Connection to these trails could create “long distance” or Regional Trails within the county. Future planning efforts should review and identify possible trail connections.

The San Dieguito River Park

The San Dieguito River Park is an ambitious project that proposes an open space system from the beaches of Del Mar to Vulcan Mountain within the community planning area of Julian. The park is a multi-jurisdictional project with a Joint Power Authority (JPA) that was formed in 1989. The members of this JPA include the Cities of Del Mar, Poway, Solana Beach, Escondido, San Diego and the County of San Diego. This is a unique and cooperative arrangement that has the potential to benefit residents of all the participating and adjacent communities. Within this park there is a 55-mile long, multi-use trail segment known as the Coast to Crest Trail.

There is a conceptual plan and alignment for the trail location. The JPA has no land use authority and relies on the participating agencies to request easements as development projects are proposed. The conceptual plan (River Park Concept Plan) has never been brought to all of the participating agencies to consider for adoption and therefore has not been adopted into the recreation plans of the individual agencies. The JPA is currently working through the City and County of San Diego General Plan update processes to incorporate the River Park Concept Plan.

The park and subsequently the trails are within public lands and private lands whose owners have given written consent. The JPA states in their document that it appears from initial site surveys the vast majority of the trails can be accommodated within existing dirt roads or trails.

There are no policies that define how or where possible adjacent trail connections should occur. The JPA will review the opportunities when they are approached about such connections. They do have design standards and these are provided in Appendix Q.

Funding for land acquisitions and improvements (including trails) come from grants provided by public agencies and purchases in concert with land conservation groups.

Many other municipalities in the incorporated areas of the county are in the process of creating or have created trail Master Plans. Most of these municipalities share a border with the county of San Diego. The following is a brief overview of their Trail Programs:

City of Chula Vista

The City of Chula Vista is currently looking at preparing the City's Greenbelt Master Plan. This Master Plan would include a regional bike path system located in Otay Valley Regional Park. This trail could connect to the existing trail system that is in the southern portion of the county and could extend to the California Riding and Hiking Trail. The planning effort for the bike path is in the early stages and coordination between the City and the County could take place.

The City of Encinitas

The City of Encinitas prepared a draft Trails Master Plan in December of 1999. The document is currently being reviewed but has not been adopted. The City has approximately 10 miles of existing trails, another 17 miles of trail easements, and access to about 5 miles of trails along the San Elijo Lagoon. The City would be looking for opportunities to connect the Olivenhain community to the Elfin Forest area and other surrounding trails that might be within the county area. All of the City's trails are multi-use but they will review future ones to determine if there might be user conflicts. The planning of trails is accomplished through the planning department while the parks department is responsible for maintenance and operations of trails. The City of Encinitas would be a willing partner with the County to find new opportunities for trails within their sphere of influence.

City of Escondido

The City of Escondido has an adopted Trail Plan in which many of the trails would be located on the east side, bordering the county. The City would be willing to talk to the County and look for opportunities that would be beneficial for both.

City of Oceanside

The City of Oceanside has a recreation trail element in its General Plan. The trail element was adopted in 1996 and includes bike, pedestrian, and equestrian trail maps along with policies and design guidelines. Many of the existing trails are considered shared-use, although planning efforts include a separation of uses whenever feasible.

Trail connections beyond the boundaries of Oceanside are not formally addressed but do exist in many cases. The City would encourage future trail connections and coordination with the County and seeks the opportunity to link to adjacent trail systems. A partnership for a rail to trail project is currently in the works with North County Transit District (NCTD) in the lead. Trail planning is accomplished through the planning department while capital improvements, the traffic department, or the parks department may manage trail construction depending on the location of the trail segment. The parks or property management department is responsible for maintenance and operation of trails.

City of Poway

The City of Poway addresses overall goals for their Trail System within the General Plan and also has a stand-alone Master Plan document that identifies trail corridors and establishes design guidelines. The City requires that developers build trail segments that are identified on the Master Plan and currently has approximately ten segments under construction through various new developments. The planning and maintenance of trails is the responsibility of the Public Works Department.

The City's trail system includes both urban and wilderness trails. The urban trails are used as transportation corridors and link community facilities while the wilderness trails are located in open space areas and provide a rural experience. The City has extensive trail linkages and has coordinated with the County on past efforts including a plan that shows all trail connections that extend beyond the city boundaries. These connections include trails that connect to Ramona in the east, San Diego in the west, and San Dieguito in the north. In addition, a City of Poway trail connects to the Trans County Trail to the south.

City of San Diego

The City of San Diego addresses trails within community plans. Most trails are located in parks and urban canyons and are considered multi-use. Linking trails to other trails beyond the City limits is something the City is interested in and a partnership for a portion of the Trans County Trail has been initiated with Poway and the County of San Diego. The planning of trails is accomplished through the planning department while the parks department is responsible for maintenance and operation of trails.

City of San Marcos

The City of San Marcos addresses trails within a Trail Master Plan, which is a 1991 General Plan amendment. The Trail Master Plan makes up two-thirds of the General Plan and encourages trail linkages beyond the City's boundaries. The City is a member of the North County Regional Trail Group and is actively involved in a Rail Trail project that will form a link to Escondido.

The City considers its trails to be multi-use and mostly urban in character (paved), which would not be appropriate for equestrian users. Some future trails, including the Rail Trail project, will have soft surfaces and would be appropriate for different user groups. All new developments must construct trail segments identified on the Trail Master Plan as a condition of approval. The maintenance cost would be covered by the Community Facility District (CFD) that will benefit the most from the trail segment. The planning of trails is accomplished through the community services department while the engineering department is responsible for plan review and public works oversees trail construction.

City of Santee

The City of Santee currently addresses trails as a Trail Element within their General Plan. A study for bike paths was also completed in the 90s and they will be updating their General Plan for 2020. Most of their existing trails are urban in character (paved pathways) and they do not currently connect to trails outside of their jurisdiction. However, connections beyond their borders are definitely an element the City is pursuing. A JPA has been formed between the City of Santee, the County of San Diego, the State, and the City of Poway for a trail connection through Sycamore Canyon to allow public access to Gooden Ranch, a donated open space within the City. This and other partnerships have been initiated and the City will continue to support this type of partnership in order to encourage trails that can be shared by multiple jurisdictions. The planning of trails is done through the development services department while the public services department is responsible for maintenance of trails.

City of Vista

The City of Vista addresses trails within their General Plan and intends to update the trail element in the near future. The existing trail system is minimal and little of the General Plan trail map from the 80s has been implemented. All existing trails are contained within the City's boundaries but linkages to adjacent trails are encouraged by General Plan policies and will continue to be promoted by the City. A study of scenic roadways and community identity completed in the 90s describes trail linkages between important local and regional attractions that will continue to be explored as part of the General Plan update process. The planning of trails is accomplished through the planning department while the community services and parks departments are responsible for maintenance and operations of trails and prioritization of trail construction projects.

Constraints

Some of the existing trails are not currently linked to other trails or form dead ends. This provides for poor connectivity and a lack of a significant length to satisfy the trail users.

Most of the public agencies have limited financial resources for the implementation, maintenance, and operation of their trail systems. Future trail implementation may be limited due to this restriction.

Existing Rail Lines

Opportunity

Existing rail corridors could be included in a "Rails to Trails" type program and provide possible trail linkage at the regional and community level. As an example, the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) owns the right-of-way of the old San Diego & Arizona Eastern (SD&AE) Railroad corridor, which extends from State Route 94 near Tecate to the County Line near Interstate 8. This rail corridor is currently not in use, but the San Diego Unified Port District and SANDAG are considering significant improvements along the corridor that would allow for freight and passenger rail use. Portions of this rail corridor could be considered for trail linkage or additional regional trails. The North County Transit District is currently pursuing a rail trail link, and a partnership with the City of Oceanside has been initiated.

Constraints

Implementation of trails along an operating rail corridor need to consider safety issues associated with pedestrian activity adjacent to rail operations. MTDB's current policy does not permit the shared use of their right-of-way for cyclists or pedestrians.

Abandoned Rail Lines

Opportunity

Existing or future abandoned rail lines could be converted to a "Rails to Trails" type program. The abandoned lines could provide possible links at the regional and community level. Many of these rail conversions have occurred throughout the U.S. and Canada. In San Diego County there have been a few lines, mainly in urban areas, where conversion has occurred. A good example is the Bay Shore Bikeway that runs along the Strand between the cities of Coronado and Imperial Beach. This bikeway was recently extended into San Diego along the southern edge of the San Diego Bay.

Constraints

Negotiations to transfer rail lines to an alternative use may require considerable effort and time to resolve and complete. These types of negotiations could involve significant financial and administrative resources to conclude a deal that is beneficial to the County. There are no known abandoned rail lines in the County of San Diego.

Existing County General Plan and Policies for Trail Implementation

Opportunity

The existing method for implementing trails is through the County's General Plan, Chapter 3 Riding and Hiking Trail Plan and Program, and Board of Supervisors (BOS) Policy I-116. The General Plan includes broad goals and objectives, as well as policies and action items intended to address implementation. Issues such as funding, acquisition and management are also discussed. Board Policy I-116 supplements the general plan and provides criteria for the development and operation of a regional and community plan non-motorized trails and pathways system.

The recent adoption of the County's MSCP provides more opportunities for new trails and for new trail experiences. A Subarea Plan within the MSCP document applies only to the unincorporated county land and implementing ordinances. The San Diego MSCP Subarea Plan

covers 258,688 acres (11 percent) of the unincorporated county lands. The MSCP is located in the southwest portion of San Diego County. One of the few public uses permitted in the MSCP is trails for all user types. The trails that exist in these areas are required to be the first ones used. Any future trails will need to go through environmental review to assure no impacts are caused by their implementation.

The County intends to establish two other phases of the MSCP that will include a North County Subarea and an East County Subarea. It is anticipated that similar goals related to trails within these preserves will also be established. It should also be noted that with the MSCP implementation, significant private lands are designated as open space. This is part of the mitigation banking to offset impacts of development on sensitive habitat. One of the few allowable uses in the MSCP and the mitigation land banks is the provision for trails.

Because of the large area of public lands associated with the current MSCP, the opportunities to connect to existing trails either on a regional or local level is greatly enhanced.

Constraints

Chapter 3 and BOS Policy I-116 policy provide the County with the only opportunities to acquire trails through a mandatory dedication in conjunction with a Tentative Map (TM) Major Subdivision project.

The General Plan also requires a “Route Study” and the necessary environmental studies to support Voluntary Dedication. Both the route study and environmental report are submitted to BOS for final adoption.

The County’s current General Plan and Board Policy in some ways restrict the ability to implement coordinated and connected trail systems. In addition, several implementation criteria lack the flexibility needed for successful trail administration. There are also numerous features of the current County Trail Program that keep it from operating successfully. These features include:

- \$ There is a lack of administrative consolidation that unifies existing resources and facilities with similar goals and functions – i.e. the administration of trails within Parks, Open Space and MSCP lands.
- \$ There is no allocated funding, financing or other resource for implementation of trails.
- \$ There is almost total reliance on volunteers for trail construction, maintenance, and planning.

-
- \$ The only trail acquisition method that does not rely on volunteers includes trail exactions from major subdivisions if specific criteria are met.
 - \$ There is an extensive restriction on trails near agricultural lands.
 - \$ There is no distinction of trail types or user types, and construction standards are narrowly worded and inflexible.
 - \$ Acceptance of voluntary trail dedications is cumbersome and requires that specific criteria be met. These dedications require route studies that include an abundance of information as well as Board of Supervisor approval.
 - \$ Any changes to adopted trail routes are required to be processed as a General Plan Amendment.

Conclusions

Existing Trail Easements

The existing trail easements within the county should be carefully examined to determine if they truly provide feasible trail opportunities. This analysis of trail opportunities can be done when the individual communities are preparing their Trail Plans.

Other Easements

The potential for using easements established for other purposes for trails should be evaluated as trail planning efforts continue and needed connections are identified.

Existing County Roads (rights-of-way)

The existing county roads should provide pathway access for trail users to other trails within the area. They could also provide links where logical trail connections cannot be located within private lands. A system of pathways should be used to supplement or support a total network of trails and also can be considered as an alternative transportation opportunity. Because of their low aesthetic appeal, pathways should be limited. Pathways should not be the only “trail” experience provided to a community.

Community

The County should continue their efforts with the community and sponsor groups in identifying trail opportunities. The County should also assist the groups with preparing a Community/Subregional trail map that could be incorporated into a Trail Master Plan. This effort would provide the “bottom up” approach to trails that was a directive from the BOS. Also, the County should continue to use and support the local trail organizations in improving, maintaining, and providing assistance in trail implementation.

Existing Trails

The County should look at every opportunity to develop relationships (Joint Project Agreements) with other agencies and municipalities when developing options for trail master planning and site-specific trail implementation. The County should also look for any opportunity for sharing possible financial resources with these agencies. This could help determine the most cost effective way for implementing, maintaining and operating region wide trail resources.

Existing Rail Lines

The County should research all opportunities for utilizing existing rail line rights-of-way for the expansion of trails or even as a Regional Trail System. The County should initiate dialogue with the affected owners or parties to determine the viability of such a proposal and their willingness to participate. Safety is a major consideration whenever new trails are developed within a rail line corridor. The trail should not be located in an area that would preclude the multiple-use of the corridor for mass transit.

Abandoned Rail Lines

The County should look for any opportunities to expand the trail system within these abandoned rights-of-way. This would allow for an uninterrupted trail route, since they are already level, and are typically not associated with sensitive habitat areas.

Existing County General Plan and Other Policies for Trail Implementation

The County needs to update the General Plan and establish a trail policy and program that will allow for the successful implementation of a countywide trail system. Without an administrative structure that could unify existing financial resources and facilities with similar goals and functions (the administration of trails within parks, open space, and MSCP lands), a Trail

Program will not be able to flourish. Also, a Trail Program will require a General Plan policy that can be easily interpreted and modified by those who administer the program.

3.2.6 Alternatives To Deal With Incompatible Land Uses Or Constraints Issues

The following are ways of providing alternative solutions and design criteria for the major constraints issues identified in the previous sections.

Residential

Work closely with the community planning groups to identify possible concerns and develop routes and trail standards acceptable to those most affected by the trail alignment. Typically, trails should be located as far from residences as possible. Pedestrian connections to the trails should take into account privacy of residents by using setbacks. Certain design criteria could include providing buffers such as streets, sidewalks and planting between the trails and residential property. Where possible locate trails adjacent to the front yards, streets or open spaces while avoiding driveways. This location would be preferable to locating trails near private rear yards, storage areas or utility areas.

Military

Discussions with military representatives indicated that they would be opposed to any trails through their bases. Their general policy prohibits public access to the base due to issues of safety, security and enforcement. Trying to change this policy will be extremely difficult. The County should avoid trails through military bases and look to alternative routes around these areas.

Indian Reservations

Early discussions with the Indian representatives indicated that they would be opposed to any trails through their reservations. Changing this policy may be extremely difficult. The County should avoid trails through reservations and look to alternative routes around these areas.

Schools

Work closely with the school districts to identify possible concerns. The County should develop routes and trail standards that would minimize the concerns regarding the trail alignment being too close to the school. Some design standards could include fencing, gating, signage, lighting and specific design of the trail terminus that would be acceptable by the individual school.

Roads

Where trails are located near or adjacent to roadways they should provide enough of a setback to allow for a significant separation between the trail and the roadbed. Within this setback, berms and landscape plantings could be provided to minimize the visual impact of the road bed and improve the trail experience. The trails should also be located to minimize intersections with motorized vehicles. Where possible, trails should have a grade separation at these intersections. When this separation is not possible the intersections should be designed to take into consideration the trail users' safety. Providing appropriate sight distance for the trail users to the intersection is also important.

Industrial

Depending on the type of the facility and associated risk, trail alignments may need to be relocated to minimize exposure to trail users. The County should work closely with adjoining property owners and business interests to develop trail routes and standards (buffers) that would be acceptable to all concerns. Installations of signs, berms, barriers and/or fences to limit access and visibility to the hazardous areas and encountering unsafe conditions could also be provided.

Steep Terrain

Trail segments in steep terrain that face off open hillsides and near the top of ridgelines should be located to avoid creating permanent and noticeable lines or cut/fill slopes when viewed from other areas.

Agricultural Areas

Possible incompatible land uses would be trails located adjacent to agricultural lands. Realignment of trails to more compatible locations would be preferred. If the trail alignment is a critical link in the overall regional or subregional system, then establishing the trail in a location that would have the least impact should be studied. In all cases every effort should be made to establish trails in areas that have been previously disturbed and that include compatible land uses. Additional information regarding agricultural issues and possible design criteria is discussed in Chapter 2.0.

Biological Sensitive Areas

The primary method of dealing with the majority of the biological constraints issues would be through avoidance. In biologically sensitive areas (particularly in areas where sensitive species occur) it would be better to redirect the specific trail location to an area where it would not directly or indirectly impact the sensitive species. These alternative routes should have a buffer placed between the trail and the sensitive habitat that would ensure avoidance of direct and indirect impacts. Also, alternative trails could be used during seasonal or periodic closure during the breeding season or critical times. The alternative trails that are provided will also have to avoid sensitive areas. Exclusion of domestic pets should also be considered in sensitive species habitat areas.

Trail design should include barriers to control trail use and prevent environmental damage. The barriers could include fences, vegetation, stiles and/or fallen trees or branches as appropriate. Removal of mature plant material should be avoided at all costs to protect the landscape growth and to maintain the aesthetic quality of the trail.

Complete avoidance of wetland/riparian areas is recommended. If this is not possible the trail should be aligned away from the wetlands to minimize impact. Impacts to wetland/riparian areas will require mitigation measures and a lengthy review process with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

3.2.7 Agricultural Lands

According to the “1997 Census of Agriculture prepared by USDA”, San Diego County is ranked 24th for farms with sales over \$100,000 in the nation. According to the “Summary of County Agricultural Commissioners’ Reports 1998-99”, San Diego ranks 7th in California and has the second largest number of farms. Nursery and flower crops account for 62 percent of the total production. Agriculture is a vital part of the San Diego economy and produces in excess of 1.24 billion dollars based on “1999 Annual Crop Report” statistics prepared by the County Agricultural Department. Agricultural lands consist of approximately 245,000 acres or 9 percent of the total land area in the county (See Figure 3-7). In the unincorporated area of the county this amounts to 190,000 acres or 8.3 percent. With this amount of land devoted to agricultural operations, linking future trails to the existing trail network may involve dealing with agricultural issues.

To many people in the agricultural community, farming and ranching is as much a “lifestyle” decision, as it is an economic one. The ability to work outdoors, live in rural areas, carry on the

family tradition, and to be your own boss are some of the reasons that people choose this profession. To some, having trails in close proximity is considered a threat to this lifestyle. This threat includes bringing additional people into their rural area, perhaps disturbing their operations. This section of the assessment looks at these issues and others and tries to address the real and perceived concerns. The intent is to determine the best way trails can be integrated into agricultural areas while minimizing their effects to the agricultural community. But, in order to understand these effects it is necessary to understand how agricultural lands operate and function. There are a wide variety of agricultural lands in the county that produce many agricultural products. Crop production, animal production, soil types, or even temperature ranges could be used to identify agricultural lands. But in order to address future trails within agricultural lands these complex and varying types of agricultural uses need to be narrowed down to limited parameters. Agricultural lands could be divided into two major types of operations or uses:

- \$ Active Farming - This involves actual crop production, which includes a wide range of products from fruits and vegetables to nursery and flower stock.
- \$ Grazing - This generally involves land that is used for grazing purposes by a variety of animals. Grazing land could also be classified as fallow agricultural land that could later be used for future crop production.

Both of these types of uses have similar, but also separate concerns related to trails located near or through such property.

Active Farming

Providing trails near active farming lands may conflict with agricultural operations or their economic goals. These conflicts could include damage to crops, hindrance to spraying, spreading of crop disease, destruction of real property and theft. Agricultural operations frequently include the application of pesticides and/or fertilizers. Several pesticides and fertilizers may pose real hazards to humans. The County Agriculture Department issues permits for pesticide applications in order to control how restricted chemicals are applied and used. Historically restricted materials including pesticides have been addressed in the Food and Agricultural Code and the California Code of Regulations. There are several methods for controlling restricted materials such as Metam or metam sodium (commonly known by the trade name Vapam), and Methyl Bromide. The County Agricultural Department or user discretion is used to determine safety zones and setbacks when using non-restricted materials such as Malathion (an organophosphate insecticide). This in itself would tend to limit the way trails are used near active farming areas.

Also, negative public perception of the health effects related to exposure to agricultural “spraying” may limit the use of trails. Significant buffer zones are needed to assure adequate protection of the public and reduce liability to growers for certain pesticides that are used. These buffer zones can range from 50 feet to 1,000 feet wide. Because of these buffers, any trails located adjacent to agriculture may be constrained. Generally, most crops will be sprayed at some time throughout the year, but there are exceptions.

There are several plant pathogens that can cause damage, disease or death to crops. Typical examples of the most prevalent and serious pathogens include: *Phytophthora cinnamoni* and *Armillaria mellea* (*Armillaria mellea*) – root rot for citrus, and especially avocado. The *Vercillium* species attacks tomatoes and strawberries. This is important to note regarding these last two crop types. According to the County’s “Annual Crop Report”, for more than a decade tomatoes and strawberries have been identified as crops valued in excess of 10 million dollars in the San Diego region. A list of other pathogens that affect the plants in San Diego County is provided in Appendix R.

Movement of soil, including dust made airborne by walkers, vehicular activity, animal hooves, etc., spreads many of these pathogens. Also, dust that lands on crops reduces the photosynthesis process. This hinders the ability for crops to mature properly. Many pathogens are also transported by surface water run-off. However, there are no plant pathogens specifically spread by horses only according to the Plant Pathologist with the County Agricultural Department. Additional concerns include soil erosion that could occur once trails are constructed and the soil is continually disturbed by users. The trail surface can speed up surface water and cause erosion to nearby fields.

Human feces coming in contact with agricultural soils or crops can also pose a problem. Subsequent associated health problems can arise if safe food handling procedures are not followed. This is not a plant pathogen problem, but rather one involving physical contact and ingestion of fecal material. A recent sample case involves strawberries that were not properly handled in Mexico, causing an *E. coli* outbreak here in San Diego.

With these concerns for possible impacts, some in the agricultural community have suggested that future trails or pathways, even within public rights-of-ways, be restricted when trails are adjacent to agricultural lands.

Grazing

The operational issues associated with grazing or fallow lands are considerably less intensive than for active farming or crop production. Typically grazing requires less spraying of fertilizers, pesticides and other activities typical of crop production. Also, there is less of a concern related to theft since no specific crop product is grown.

As such, the potential impacts on grazing and fallow agricultural lands from potential trail location would not have as many associated constraints as the active farming areas. However, it should be noted that ranchers and farmers have genuine concerns related to cattle or other animals being subjected to abuse. The concerns range from possible cattle theft to simple disturbance of farm animals. Additionally, trespassing and damage to real property is still a concern and would need to be addressed.

General Notes

Existing agricultural lands are considered to be disturbed and typically lack the sensitive biological and cultural resources that would inhibit their use for trails.

As with any private property owner, trespassing concerns by trail users are an issue, not only relating to potential damage to real property but also liability. This has historically been of concern with agricultural landowners. However, the County's recently adopted "Defense and Indemnification Ordinance" should help to ease these liability concerns and it is recommended that such an ordinance and supporting indemnification policies be continued.

Another area of consideration in agricultural areas is the potential conflict of trails with property owners who maintain bees (apiarists). Commercial beehives located in agricultural settings and near trails may be subject to vandalism or could pose a threat to trail users including horses. This could also become a liability issue for the beekeepers.

Implementation of the Williamson Act for recreational purposes might also encourage agricultural landowners to participate in a Trail Program. However, the available incentives of the Williamson Act are limited due to Proposition 13. Proposition 13, enacted in 1978, reduced local property tax revenues by capping property tax rates at one percent and rolling back property values for tax purposes to the 1975-76 level. Annual increases in property tax bills are limited to two percent and reassessment only occurs when property changes ownership. As such, the tax reduction incentives associated with the Williamson Act are limited. See Chapter 4 section 4.4.4 on how the Williamson act might be useful.

Figure 3-7 Agricultural Land Map (11x17)

Back page of Figure 3-7

Current County of San Diego Policies Related to Trails and Agricultural Lands

The current General Plan covers trails in Part IV - Recreation Element Chapter 3 (Also see Appendix C). In this chapter, one of the objectives on page IV-33 states:

Avoid trail location on or adjacent to Agricultural lands or any land that might be unduly burdened by horse riding or hiking trails.

In Policy 2 on page IV-34 it again states:

Trails proposed by route studies shall avoid agricultural areas which are determined to be incompatible with trails or any land that might be unduly burdened by horse riding and hiking trails.

In Board of Supervisors Policy I-116 A-4 it states:

That the County shall avoid locating trails on or adjacent to agricultural land or any land for purposes of hiking, bicycling or horseback riding without the consent of the property owner.

Why minor changes to existing trail policies related to agriculture are needed:

The County should continue to place a high priority on the protection of agricultural interests and concerns. However, the existing General Plan language relative to trails is so broad and generally restrictive that placement of any trails on, or even near agricultural land appears nearly impossible if conforming to the general plan language – even for placing trails within road rights-of-way, if adjacent to agricultural land. The existing objectives and policy language provide no specific definition of agriculture, no distinction as to different types of agricultural land, and do not discuss specific burdens they may have related to trails. With the considerable amount of agricultural land in San Diego, it is apparent that trails may need to cross or be adjacent to at least a limited amount of agricultural land. If such is the case, it can likely be accomplished in a manner that adequately addresses the concerns and interests of agriculture, while providing the county with at least some limited opportunity for trail connection.

Comparison to Other Counties and Municipalities

A comparison to other counties and municipalities in Southern California regarding how trails are addressed in relationship to agricultural land use was made. Discussion with trail staff and investigation of General Plan or Master Plan language is provided.

Orange County

Orange County's General Plan Chapter VII Recreation Element makes no mention regarding agricultural issues related to trails. The County does not actively pursue trail implementation on agricultural or any other land use type. Instead, the County "conditions" projects to provide trail easements as lands come forward for development. The County maintains a goal of developing 10 to 15 miles of regional trails annually. According to County staff, due to the high rate of development the County has been experiencing, it has been able to reach this mark and has eliminated the need to pursue other trail implementation.

San Bernardino County

San Bernardino's General Plan Section II – Planning Issues – Natural Resources states:

Trails should consider the opportunities and constraints of other current land uses including, but not limited to, agriculture and residential land uses, military facilities, sewage treatment plants, landfills, and areas of heavy industry.

The County's trail staff has confirmed that no regional trail alignments pass through agricultural lands. According to staff, a mandate from the Board indicated that trails would not impact private lands in general. As such, connectivity of the Regional Trail System in large part utilizes water district and utility rights-of-way. Similar to other areas, farmers have expressed concern for the safety of their crops, animals, and equipment in terms of vandalism and theft, when considering the possibility of trails on and / or adjacent to their land.

Riverside County

Riverside County's General Plan only states that "*trails should generally not be located immediately adjacent to agricultural land uses.*" County staff recognizes that unofficial trails may exist on some of the proposed locations crossing through agricultural lands. However, until such time that development is proposed on these agricultural lands, the County will not actively pursue an easement for trail implementation.

Santa Clara County

In Santa Clara County a Trail Master Plan has been prepared. The Master Plan Map illustrates trail routes crossing agricultural lands. However, for agricultural lands abutting public roads, easements are not required outside of the County road right-of-way unless:

-
- \$ use of property changes permanently to non-agricultural;
 - \$ consent is expressed by a willing owner; or
 - \$ the trails are developed in a manner that avoids any significant impact to the agricultural productivity of those lands.

Additionally, the Santa Clara County Trail Master Plan shows trails on Ranchlands and they too do not have to provide easements outside of the County road right-of-way unless:

- \$ the County is notified of a non-renewal of the Williamson Act Contract;
- \$ active ranching and/or agricultural uses have been permanently abandoned;
- \$ the land use designation is amended to a non-ranch land designation;
- \$ there is specific interest or consent expressed by a willing property owner/seller; or
- \$ the optimum width for trail easements within agricultural lands is identified as 100 feet. This is considered an ideal easement width to provide sufficient buffer to the adjacent land use and allow for topographic variation and other as yet known difficulties. Once the trail is constructed the remainder of the unused easement could be offered back to the underlying property owner.

San Dieguito River Park

The Mule Hill/San Pasqual portion of the Coast to Crest Trail is within an agricultural preserve owned by the City of San Diego. The San Dieguito River Park worked closely with the San Pasqual Valley agricultural lessees, the San Diego County Agriculture Department, the County Agriculture Commission, and the San Diego County Farm Bureau to establish this segment of the Coast to Crest Trail. The trail has been sited or aligned to minimize impact to the existing agricultural operations. The City of San Diego and the San Dieguito River Park JPA provided indemnity to the agricultural leaseholders in exchange for the trail implementation. San Dieguito River Park has also prepared a “Protocol for Trail Closure Due to Application Of Agricultural Chemicals” (see Appendix S). This was developed to assure that the lessee would be able to close the trail when the applications of restricted chemicals are to be used.

City of San Diego

The City of San Diego has incorporated trail easements into the newer agricultural leases within San Pasqual Valley.

City of Encinitas

The City of Encinitas prepared a draft Trail Master Plan in December of 1999. The document is currently being reviewed but has not been adopted. No mention regarding agriculture was made in the Goals and Objectives section. Most of the existing agriculture uses are greenhouse production, not crops or grazing. The greenhouses are typically located within existing residential neighborhoods.

One agricultural related issue was identified with the specific plan for Encinitas Ranch. Encinitas Ranch had an existing 10-acre parcel that was being farmed. The specific plan had a trail element as part of the project development. However, the trail element of the plan was to be phased in after the 10-acre agricultural area within Encinitas Ranch was eliminated.

City of Chula Vista

The City of Chula Vista is currently looking at preparing the City's Green Belt Master Plan. This Master Plan would include a regional bike path system that would be within the Otay Valley Regional Park and Sweetwater River Valley. The bike path would ultimately connect to the Bay Shore Bikeway.

At this time the City of Chula Vista has not run into any agricultural issues but it is still early in the planning stages.

City of Escondido

The City of Escondido is significantly smaller in land area than the County and has a smaller number of trails it is trying to implement. However, it does have some of the same issues related to the relationship of agriculture lands to trails.

Escondido has prepared a Trail Master Plan and in the Location Criteria Section under "Experience" it states: *"Trails should pass through a variety of landscape types including from urban development and agricultural lands to canyons, slopes, and ridge-tops of rural landscape."*

The City policy regarding trails on agricultural lands is to have the property owner's consent. The City does show trails on agricultural lands but does not actively pursue trail implementation from them. Instead, they wait until the owners of agricultural lands come forward for development and require the trail easement at that time. If there are residual "farm lands"

remaining within the proposed development, the City then tries to locate the trail in these areas. This retains the variety of trail experience that the City wants to have in its trail system.

A current example of this is Hidden Trails. This project is a 300-acre former avocado grove that will become a residential development. Portions of the existing grove will be preserved and retained by a Home Owners Association. A one-mile public trail (a significant section of the Rural Regional Connector Trail) was sited within the avocado grove on an existing paved road. The trail is multi-use allowing for hikers, bikers and equestrians. This trail will connect to the 67-acre park and will ultimately reach San Pasqual Valley.

Conclusions

There are many legitimate concerns identified by agricultural interests related to the potential impacts of trails near agricultural lands. As such, the County should continue to place a high priority on the protection of agricultural interests and concerns. In some cases, the best way to protect these interests will be to avoid the area entirely. However, in other cases, proper location, design, construction and active management may adequately minimize potential impacts.

In meeting with agricultural interests during this assessment it became apparent that the reason for much of the existing general plan language calling for a total “avoidance of all agriculture” was at least partially due to the agricultural community’s concern about the County’s past trail planning process and lack of committed trail management resources. The County’s past approach to trails was very broad and no specific detailed planning document was being followed. Because of this, the agricultural community may have been concerned that any and all agricultural land could potentially be impacted by trails. Their main concerns included the potential loss of the use of their land that would impact the economic viability of their operations, and the potential adverse impact to their lifestyle.

At this point in time, it appears that the local agricultural industry may be willing to consider limited trail access affecting agricultural land if: 1) there is a specific proposal presented, 2) they can have input beginning at the initial stages of plan development, 3) they are adequately compensated for trail access with monetary or other incentives, 4) the County commits to providing specific attention to location and construction details to minimize impacts, 5) the County commits adequate resources to effectively manage the trails, and 6) land owners are given certain controls, such as the ability to temporarily close trails during pesticide application operations and at other times necessary for the continued economic viability of their land.

In all cases trails should not become a burden that infringe on the rights of the farmers/ranchers to successfully operate their businesses. However, trails through agricultural lands can work.

Ensuring success will require a serious commitment by the County and a long-term working relationship with the agricultural community.

This commitment would include provision of the six items discussed above with focused attention on involving the agricultural community during the designing and planning of specific trail segments near or within agricultural lands. Today there are numerous trails that co-exist with agricultural lands. Some examples include San Pasqual Valley in San Diego County, San Mateo County, or along the levees in Sonoma County. However, there does need to be willingness by the landowner.

In the rural areas of the county there are significant areas devoted to agricultural uses. These areas will become critical in assisting the County to create a meaningful or well-connected trail system. To achieve this connectivity goal the current policy language in the General Plan needs to be modified.

In addition, if trails are provided in areas where crop production occurs, the following design standards could be instituted to significantly reduce or eliminate potential impacts:

- \$ Use fences or barriers between the crop edges and the trail. (This would help minimize possible theft and also define the limits of the trail.)
- \$ Designate specific trail locations within or near agricultural lands. (This would help control or minimize trespassing concerns).
- \$ Post private property signs on the trail fences every 100 feet. (Again, this will assist in identifying and reaffirming the location of private properties and minimize trespassing).
- \$ The County could continue its provision of indemnity for properties that provide trail easements or properties adjacent to the trails. (This would eliminate liability concerns of property owners of possible lawsuits or claims brought against them by trail users.)
- \$ Close trails during the application of pesticides/fertilizers, during harvesting time, or for crop quarantine purposes. This would require lockable gates at the beginning and end of trail segments and a serious commitment to active trail management by the County. (This would be a method to control the use of the trails when the area would be most hazardous to users, and at times when operational disruptions to agriculture could have negative economic impacts.)

-
- \$ Trails through agricultural land could be surfaced with a material that would minimize dust. (This would help minimize pathogens that would travel with the airborne dust.)
 - \$ Motorized vehicles should be restricted on all trails especially near agricultural lands. (This would also minimize airborne dust as well as the possibility of theft and destruction of private property.)
 - \$ Dogs should be restricted on certain trails in agricultural lands especially where livestock is present. (This would minimize possible conflicts between livestock and dogs.)
 - \$ Locate information signs at the beginning and end of trail segments through agricultural lands. (This would alert users that they are entering agricultural land and would be important when the trails are closed for spraying or harvesting.)
 - \$ Where possible, locate trails along the edge (or perimeter) of agricultural land instead of across them. (This would minimize the impact of trail closures during spraying or harvesting.)
 - \$ The County could provide financial incentive by paying a fee for the use of the trail easement. This fee could be based on the amount the property owner would make on that land had it been in production. (This would provide an incentive to the landowner to willingly work with the County on locating trails on his property.)
 - \$ The County could provide an agricultural landowner a revocable license agreement for the trail easement. (This would provide the property owner the ability to terminate trail access if the trail is not properly maintained or if there are problems with trail management.)
 - \$ Proper support facilities should be provided at trailheads located near agricultural lands. These facilities would include parking, water, restrooms and trash receptacles. (This could help reduce possible contamination of crops by human fecal matter. It could also control waste and litter crossing over to private lands.)

These same standards could be used in agricultural areas where grazing currently exists. This would eliminate any physical changes to the trails and associated facilities if the landowner decides to go into crop production at a future date.

3.3 TRAIL ACQUISITION OPTIONS

Implementing a trail network requires the use of a variety of tools for acquisition, development, operation and maintenance. This section describes the various methods of trail acquisition and provides a review and comparison of the various methods of trail acquisitions made by other counties in Southern California. Discussion with trail staff and investigation of General Plan language for the counties of Los Angeles, Riverside, Orange, and San Bernardino indicate that each of the counties utilized several of the trail acquisition policies described below.

3.3.1 Cooperative or Joint Agreements

The County could formulate joint agreements with public and private agencies that are responsible for utility corridors to cooperate in the establishment of permanent trail segments. This could include various water and sewer districts, and utility companies. This type of agreement could also be used with school districts and other semi-public agencies where trails or trailheads could be located.

Comparison

Each county studied has language within its General Plan to encourage cooperative agreements for establishing trails. Below are excerpts from each County.

Riverside County

Where possible, the County should institute joint agreements with public and private agencies such as utility companies, the Riverside County Flood Control District and Railroad companies which control easements, or unused rights-of-way in order to incorporate such lands into permanent trail linkages throughout the County.

Orange County

The County shall incorporate the development of Regional Trails in public flood control, road, and park projects whenever feasible. Where feasible, the County shall coordinate with the Fire Authority to use their crews and equipment to construct and maintain trails that may also serve as emergency access routes or firebreaks. The County shall coordinate with cities to arrange joint development programs for Regional Trails that are in or near those cities.

San Bernardino County

The County shall: Use lands already in public ownership or proposed for public acquisition, such as rights-of-way for flood control channels, abandoned railroad lines and fire control roads for trails whenever possible, in preference to private property; use active and abandoned road, utility, and railroad rights-of-way for nonvehicular circulation in all new development when found feasible.

3.3.2 Fee Purchase

Purchase of easements may be necessary on private parcels where development has already occurred, and there is little prospect of redevelopment that would allow the County to condition a project for future trail implementation. This may be the only way a system of trails can be implemented when the trails are disconnected by private properties.

3.3.3 Park Land Development Ordinance (PLDO) Funds

PLDO funds provide a portion of the County's General Fund used for parks and open space. The current policy allows these funds to be used for the acquisition of riding and hiking trails. This funding process could also be used for on-going maintenance, improvements, and operations of a trail system. However, it should be noted that the current PLDO funds have been inadequate to even address the regional and local park requirements. If the PLDO funds were used for a Countywide Trail System it would place an additional burden on these funds. This effort is further described in Chapter 4 as part of the financial consideration for trail.

3.3.4 Land Donations and Tax Credits

Park Land Dedication Credit

A park land dedication credit could be used for trails similar to that already provided by parks. The credit would be in the form of dedicated land or in lieu of fees or a combination of both. This would apply to all projects that would be processed in the County. The current ordinance excludes riding and hiking trails. An amendment to include the riding and hiking trails could be made to the current ordinance. The ordinance could also be amended to specifically provide park land dedication credit for dedication of riding and hiking trails to the public use.

Natural Heritage Preservation Tax Credit

The Natural Heritage Preservation Tax Credit Act allows landowners to donate property to state or local agencies or non-profit organizations for a partial state tax credit (55 percent of fair market value). Both land and conservation easements can be donated. Donated land must be open space, parkland, woodland, wildlife corridors, agricultural land, or archaeological sites. The State Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) administers this \$100 million program.

Income Tax Deductions for Charitable Contributions

A federal income tax deduction is allowed for a gift of property or real property interests for conservation purposes. The amount of the tax deduction would be the fair market value of the property or the interest in the property conveyed to the charitable organization or public entity (the County). A permanent recorded restriction is required for tax deductions taken for the gift of a conservation easement.

Williamson Act

The Williamson Act enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use such as recreational trail easements. In return, landowners receive property tax assessments, which are much lower than normal because they are based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. The landowner enters into a contract with the County or City to restrict land uses to those compatible with agriculture, wildlife habitat, scenic corridors, recreational use, or open space. To date, this type of incentive has fallen out of favor and not been used with the County of San Diego's agricultural community since the passage of Proposition 13.

Density Bonus

A modest density bonus could be provided allowing developers to build more units on a property than would otherwise be permitted. State statute allows a local agency to grant density bonuses for various types of development projects when certain public benefits are derived from the projects. It has been shown that trails provide benefits to the general public, thereby qualifying a project to be allowed for a density bonus. The County could adopt a density bonus provision to those projects providing trails if the County deems an appropriate incentive.

Voluntary Offer of Dedication

Based on the Board of Supervisors Policy I-116, the County staff is encouraged to work with developers to accept voluntary offers of dedication of trail easements. These dedications are for routes that are identified in the proposed Regional and various unadopted Community/Sub-regional Plan Trail Maps. Prior to the offer of dedication being accepted, the Board would adopt a route study and environmental analysis.

In theory this policy is a good one. However, it is a cumbersome and lengthy process with the routing study and the environmental analysis going back to the BOS for approval. Streamlining the review and approval would help in making this a more viable option for acquisitions.

Donations/Non-Profit Group

Currently the County has significant support for its Trail Program from many trail organizations and advocates. The major trail user represents all these advocates including equestrians, hikers and bikers. The County could establish a non-profit coalition of trail advocates that would support the trail's goals and solicit donations for the purchase, development, maintenance and management of trails. Also, in the past, land conservation groups have played a significant role in assisting the County in raising funds privately and publicly from grants.

Comparison

Each county studied has language within its General Plan to encourage volunteers and organizations to participate in all aspects of trail purchase, development, maintenance, and management.

Riverside County

Local communities should be encouraged to finance their own Community Trail Systems.

Orange County

An adopt-a-trail program shall be established and advertised to allow service organizations, businesses, trail user groups, and other entities to construct and/or maintain a trail or trail segment.

The County shall: Encourage the use of volunteers and volunteer organizations to assist in development, operations, maintenance and education activities related to trails.

3.3.5 Grants

Federal Grant Programs

The use of federal or state grants funds for the acquisition of private lands for trail implementation is a funding mechanism frequently used by other counties in Southern California. The varieties of grants are significant and include funds set-aside for recreational trail projects as well as those earmarked for bikeways. The most promising source of federal funding is through the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and the Transportation Equity Act (TEA-21). ISTEA and TEA-21 include the following grant programs for recreational trails and bikeways:

National Recreational Trails Fund Act

This funding program provides grants for the development and maintenance of recreational trails to benefit bicycles, pedestrians, and other non-motorized users. A 30 percent non-federal match is required for recreational trail funding in the following categories:

- \$ Acquisition of property and easements for recreational trails and trail corridors.
- \$ Construction of new recreational trails.
- \$ Development and rehabilitation of trailside and trailhead facilities and trail linkages.

The program is administered through the State Parks Department Local Services Section.

National Scenic Byways Program

This program provides funding for bicycle and pedestrian access and safety projects along federal and state scenic byways, including those designated as “All-American Roads,” “National Scenic Byways,” and “State Scenic Byways.” A 20 percent local or state match is required. The FHWA California Division administers the program.

Surface Transportation Program

The ISTEA Surface Transportation Program includes a provision to provide funding grants for the preservation of abandoned railway corridors. These corridors have been successfully transformed into recreational trails in many states through “Rails to Trails” programs. A 20 percent non-federal match is required. Local jurisdictions submit grant applications to the FHWA California Division.

State Grant Programs

As with the federal grant programs listed above, state funding programs include grants set-aside for both recreational trail projects and bikeway projects. The most promising source of state funding for recreational trail acquisition is through the California Park Bond Act of 2000. This Act provides over \$340 million statewide for recreation facility acquisition, development, improvement, and interpretation through the “Per Capita I” and “Non-Motorized Trails Grant” Programs described below. State grant programs established by other enabling legislation may also be promising sources of trail acquisition funding and are described in this section as well.

Per Capita I

The Per Capita I program provides \$338 million for the acquisition, development, improvement, restoration, enhancement, and interpretation of local park and recreation lands and facilities. The program is administered by the State Parks Department with the general goals of providing for open, safe, and accessible local park lands and promoting family-oriented recreation. Guidelines for a project to qualify for funding are still being developed, but recreational trails typically qualify for this type of recreation-oriented funding grant.

Non-Motorized Trail Grants

The Non-Motorized Trail Grants program provides funding for the acquisition, development, improvement and interpretation of non-motorized trails. This program has \$1.74 million available on a competitive-application basis. Important selection criteria under the program include linkages to other trails, parks, scenic corridors, and recreation areas. The State Parks Department administers the program.

Recreational Trails Program

The California Recreational Trails Program provides grants for recreational trails and trails-related projects. These grants can be used for acquisition of title or easements to property for

recreational trails, construction of new recreational trails, and development and rehabilitation of trailside and trailhead facilities and trail linkages. The State Parks Department administers this program which provides \$2.2 million statewide to cover 80 percent of project costs for non-motorized trails projects.

Habitat Conservation Fund

The Habitat Conservation Fund provides grants for Trail Programs in urban as well as rural areas, including acquisition of land, restoration of wildlife corridors and interpretive programs. Funding is limited to \$2 million per year statewide, and a 50 percent match from local funds is required. The State Parks Department administers the program.

Land and Water Conservation Fund

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is administered by the State Parks Department and the National Parks Service, and includes a provision for funding of hiking and biking trails. \$2.6 million in grants are available in Southern California for the acquisition, development, and maintenance of park and recreation areas and facilities. Projects compete for funding in a competitive selection process, and a 50 percent match from local funds is required. Property acquired or developed under this program must be retained in perpetuity for public recreational use.

Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program

The California Resources Agency administers this program, which provides funding grants for roadside recreational facilities including trails. The funding program is for projects that mitigate the impact of new or modified public transportation facilities. California Transportation Commission approval is required for projects to receive a share of the \$10 million in grants available statewide.

3.3.6 Mandatory Dedications

Currently the County has the ability to require trail easement dedications in conjunction with a Tentative Map (TM) of Major Subdivisions. Acquisitions of trails from developers occur when a development proposal is submitted to the County for review and approval and the project site contains a designated trail as identified by the County. This is also in accordance with Board of Supervisor Policy I-116. This policy establishes the criteria for the Development and Operation of a Regional and Community Plan Non-Motorized Trails and Pathway System. A County Trail

System would benefit from being able to require dedication of trail easements with other discretionary actions or use permits that could include:

- \$ Subdivision Maps (Tentative Map)
- \$ Use Permits
- \$ Site Plan Review
- \$ Variance
- \$ Administrative Permit
- \$ General Plan Amendment
- \$ Zoning Ordinance Amendment

However, for the County to require both the dedication and improvement of the trail as a condition of approval for any of the above actions a nexus and a proportionality needs to be found between the proposed project and the requested trail dedication and improvement. The following process is recommended to determine which of the permit processes should be used for requiring mandatory dedication:

- Establish a Trail Plan that identifies the general trail alignments.
- Establish the existing zoning and processing requirements within those areas noted for trails.
- Prepare a nexus and proportionality study to determine who would be affected by the proposed trails.
- Define which discretionary action or permits would best be used to extract the mandatory dedication for trail implementation.

Once this has been completed the County can prepare the necessary supporting ordinances or policies to establish and implement the mandatory dedication policy for trails. Further discussion on the approach related to Nexus and Proportionality Issues (Mandatory Dedication) is in Section 3.4

Comparison

Each county studied required trail dedication as a condition of approval for development projects when the project affects an established trail system alignment. All of the Counties indicated that their dedication requirements are applicable to all types of development (e.g., major subdivision, minor driveway addition). Although the specific General Plan language regarding trail acquisition varies for each county, mandatory dedication is common practice. Most of the cities or counties studied had some form of mandatory dedication for their Trail Program. The following summaries illustrate the difference in language used by other cities and counties or how they use mandatory dedication.

Riverside County

Trail easements can be acquired through subdivision and development approvals. The County Parks Department shall be consulted as part of the development review process regarding any development proposals which contain existing or proposed regional trail segments as shown on the Parks and Recreation Map and on the 1"=800' scale Area Information Maps. The County's mandatory dedication process is currently under review and may be changed to strengthen its dedication process. Currently no nexus study has been done in support of the mandatory dedication.

The County Parks Department may require both the dedication and improvement of the trail segment(s) as a condition of development approval. However, expectance of the easement and/or the improvements only occurs when there is sufficient funding available or funding has been identified for the maintenance and operation of the dedicated trail.

Per Council Policy J-11, Community Trails are the responsibility of "others" not the Parks Department. Typically, County Service Areas (CSA) which are set up within individual communities review development plans to insure that any Community Trails identified on Specific Plans are dedicated.

Orange County

The dedication and acquisition of trail right-of-way and construction of public regional riding and hiking trails and improvements shall be pursued as a condition of approval of development projects (i.e., irrevocable offers of recreation easements) consistent with the Master Plan.

San Bernardino County

The county shall: Encourage the dedication or offers of dedication of trail easements where appropriate for establishing a planned trail system alignment, or where an established trail is jeopardized by impending development or subdivision activity; require proposed development adjacent to trail systems to dedicate land for trailhead access points. Existing right-of-way and surplus public properties should be utilized for staging areas whenever possible.

City of Encinitas

The City of Encinitas uses mandatory dedication for trail acquisition. The planning department obtains the trail dedication through development permit processes. A nexus study is done on a case-by-case basis as projects with trails identified on their property come forward for

development. At that time a nexus and proportionality study is done to determine the proportional share that the proposed project must provide. The city's park impact fee includes the necessary funds for the Trail Program. A portion of this fee is used specifically for the acquisition, maintenance and operation of trails

City of Oceanside

The City of Oceanside requires dedication of land for trails/pathways based upon the recreational trail element that is part of the General Plan. Maps include bike, pedestrian, and equestrian overlays that establish various classes of trails. Construction of the trails or pathways may be required as well through the tentative map review and improvement plan review processes.

City of Poway

The City of Poway requires dedication of land and often trail construction based upon the Trail Master Plan in the city's General Plan. Dedication can be required at any level of review for proposed development, from subdivision maps down to single family and parcel splits. The City sometimes simply requires an easement and other times requires that the developer construct the trail segment. Generally initial plan review identifies the need for a trail segment and the developer then includes the trail with the design development and construction documents that are submitted to the City for approval.

City of San Diego

The City of San Diego requires that trail and pathways easements become dedicated and sometimes constructed as a condition of approval for tentative maps/public improvement plans. Trail segment locations are identified through community plan maps.

City of San Marcos

The City of San Marcos requires trail dedication and in some cases improvements for the trails based upon the 1991 Master Trail Plan. In general, single-family residences, agricultural, and retail development only have a trail dedication requirement, while residential subdivisions and industrial and commercial projects may have both a dedication and improvement requirement, meaning that the developer would be required to construct the trail segment as required by the Master Trail Plan. Guidelines are established and the trails are required through the ministerial and discretionary approval processes. A nexus study was completed and the trail dedication and improvement requirements have not been challenged to date.

City of Santee

The City of Santee requires dedication of land for trails through the subdivision map approval process as well as the reclamation plan approval process. Bike and equestrian trails identified on maps that are part of the General Plan Trail Element are used to determine which projects should include trails as a condition of approval.

City of Vista

The City of Vista requires dedication of land for trails through the site plan approval process. Trails identified within the General Plan must be constructed and/or the developer must provide an easement for a future trail link. Trails will be a part of Vista's General Plan 2020 and it is anticipated that the mandatory dedication policy will be continued and reinforced as the trail maps are updated and feasibility is considered in the update process.

3.3.7 Eminent Domain

Another method of property acquisition is "eminent domain" (also called "condemnation"), which is the power of government agencies to acquire property for "public use" so long as the government pays "just compensation." The County can exercise its power of eminent domain even if the owner does not wish to sell his or her property. Eminent domain is rarely used for trail acquisition as noted below.

Before the County can commence an eminent domain proceeding in court, it must adopt a formal resolution to acquire the property, which is known as a "resolution of necessity." A "resolution of necessity" is the government agency's formal decision to acquire property by eminent domain. It must be adopted before the condemning agency can commence an eminent domain action in court.

California Code of Civil Procedure section 1245.230 provides that in order to adopt a resolution of necessity, the government agency must find (1) *that the project for which the property is to be acquired is necessary*; (2) *that the property is necessary for the public project*; (3) *that the project is located in such a manner as to offer the greatest public benefit with the least private detriment*; and (4) *that an offer to purchase the property has been made*. The resolution of necessity must be adopted at a public hearing.

The government is required to pay the "fair market value" of the property it acquires by eminent domain. California's Eminent Domain Law generally defines fair market value as:

The fair market value of the property taken is the highest price on the date of valuation that would be agreed to by the seller, being willing to sell but under no particular or urgent necessity for doing, nor obliged to sell, and a buyer, being ready, willing and able to buy but under no particular necessity for so doing, each dealing with the other with full knowledge of all the uses and purposes for which the property is reasonably adaptable and available.

In the case of land acquisition for recreational trails, the County would generally only need a strip of land for the trail and/or a portion of the land for a trailhead, staging area, and/or parking lot. In this case, just compensation is determined not only by the value of the part taken, but also by the damage to the remaining property. Such damages are called "severance damages," i.e., damages caused by severance of the remainder from the part taken. "Severance damage" as a general proposition, is the amount of damage to the remaining portion of the parcel which is caused by the severance of the remainder from the part taken, or by the construction and operation of the project for which the property is taken. Severance damages may be minimal or non-existent in some cases. In others, they can be quite high -- sometimes approaching the value of the entire property.

California Government Code section 7267.2 requires government agencies to obtain an independent fee appraisal and make an offer to the owner of record of real property to be acquired before the agency may commence court proceedings. The offer generally must be in an amount no less than the independent appraisal approved by the agency. A property owner is not required to accept the condemning agency's offer. Instead, the property owner may make a counter-offer, or may assert a higher value for their property once the eminent domain action is filed in court. Property owners often receive higher, and in some cases, much higher compensation than the amount of the condemning agency's offer by asserting a claim for greater compensation in the eminent domain proceeding.

Owners are entitled to compensation not only for their property, but also for "improvements pertaining to realty." These improvements can be anything including fencing, landscaping, and pavement, depending upon the particular situation. The government is required to pay the fair market value "in place" of such improvements. Value "in place" generally means the value of the improvements as part of a going concern, as opposed to salvage value or replacement cost.

Comparison

Although each county questioned has the option of acquiring an easement through the use of eminent domain, the use of this option is rare and is considered to be relatively extreme. Only one of the Southern California counties that were contacted shared an instance when eminent

domain was used for acquisition. Los Angeles County recently used their eminent domain to provide a linkage from their Regional Trail System to the State Park system in Arrastre Canyon. In this case, the property owner was unwilling to provide the easement. The use of eminent domain is generally considered only as a last resort.

3.3.8 Conclusions

As noted above, there are a number of acquisition options available; however, the County does not currently take advantage of many of these options. Although BS Policy I-116 states a few options such as mandatory dedication at the Major Subdivision review level, user fees, private sources, donated services and grants (to be pursued aggressively by staff and the Board), the County does not have the management or personnel structure in place to accomplish this directive.

The County should provide as many acquisition options as possible to fund the implementation of trails and to provide for the future maintenance of trails and pathways. Additional funding mechanisms are discussed in Chapter 4 - Financial Considerations. Before initiating any acquisition options the County should organize an Implementation Program and Management Model for the Trail Program. This Management Model would provide the necessary administrative structure that would ensure the overall success of a Trail Program.

3.4. NEXUS AND PROPORTIONALITY ISSUES (MANDATORY DEDICATION)

3.4.1 Introduction

In order for a governmental agency to collect fees from a developer, the agency must be able to demonstrate that a reasonable relationship, or "nexus," exists between the fees collected and the development proposed. The burden of making detailed findings to establish the nexus lies with the government and is essentially a characterization of the linkage between the asserted public purpose underlying the regulatory mechanism and any conditions attached to approval of a land use action.

Along with characterizing the nexus, a government agency collecting fees or land dedications must assure that the exaction is "proportional" to the type and scale of the development being proposed. The proportionality standard outlines the nature and amount of the exaction in relation to both the impacts generated by the development of the project and the benefit that accrues to the development from the exaction.

The methodology outlined below addresses how to define a reasonable relationship, or nexus, between the County of San Diego trail system and an individual development project. The requirement to define a "reasonable relationship" applies to a variety of techniques that can be used by local government agencies to fund the development of public facilities. Notably, these include:

1. Land Dedication by Ordinance: involving dedication of real property within a proposed subdivision. Though limited in application and to subdivisions of certain size¹, dedication of real property or easements is usually established by ordinance² and most often is used to provide park and recreation facilities. In the case of a land dedication ordinance, which could include in-lieu fees, the amount and location of land to be dedicated or the fees to be paid must bear a reasonable relationship to the use of the recreation by the future inhabitants of the subdivision.

¹ For example, a subdivider may be required to dedicate roadways to the public as well as such additional land as may be necessary and feasible to provide bicycle paths for the use and safety of the residents of the subdivision, if the subdivision, as shown on the final map thereof, contains 200 or more parcels (California Government Code 66475.1).

² Authorized under California Government Code, Section 66475.
County of San Diego Park Land Dedication Ordinance Section 810.101-114

Because the benefits of trails (see Chapter 2.0) are broad and varied it is likely that while a regional, sub-regional, or community trail would benefit the community as a whole, it would also benefit all inhabitants of a subdivision, whether or not they elected to actually use a trail. For example, it has been well documented that in urban and suburban areas, homes near trails enjoy an increased value over equivalent homes not near trails. It has also been documented that the sale of a home near a trail enjoys a faster turnover time than a comparable home for sale not near a trail³. While land dedication could be applied to trails, it may be argued that the area of land dedicated to trails would reduce a particular project's requirement for other lands to be set aside for other park purposes.

2. Impact Fees: involving the assignment of development impact fees⁴ to a variety of projects not necessarily limited to subdivisions for residential development.

In determining a development impact fee, it is typically required that a local agency:

- \$ Identify the purpose of the fee.
- \$ Identify the use/public facilities to which the fee is to be allocated. That identification may, but need not be made: by reference to a capital improvement plan; in applicable general or specific plan requirements; or in other public documents that identify the public facilities for which the fee is charged.
- \$ Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.
- \$ Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.

³ Seattle Engineering Department, Office of Planning. May, 1987. *Evaluation of the Burke-Gilman Trail's Effect on Property Values and Crime*.
Murphy, Michelle Miller. 1992. *The Impact of the Brush Creek Trail on Property Values and Crime*. Sonoma State University, Sonoma, California.
East Bay Regional Park District. *Lafayette-Moraga Trail Evaluation*.

⁴Authorized under California Government Code, Section 66000.

3.4.2 Approach

Identify the Purpose of the Trails (Step 1)

Document the Need for Trails

Define the need for trails by documenting both quantifiable and anecdotal evidence justifying that trails are a legitimate public purpose. References include:

- \$ January, 2001 telephone survey conducted for the County of San Diego Trail System Assessment
- \$ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 1996. *A Report of the Surgeon General: Physical Activity and Health*. Atlanta, Georgia
- \$ Source: U.S. Department of Transportation. Federal Highway Administration. 1997. *Our Nation's Travel: 1995 NPTS Early Results Report*. Lanham, Maryland
- \$ California State Parks. *Public Opinions and Attitudes On Outdoor Recreation in California 1997. An Element of the California Outdoor Recreation Planning Program*. Sacramento, California
- \$ California Center for Health Improvement/The Field Institute. 2001. *Californians' Beliefs About Health: A Survey of California Adults on Population Health Issues*. Sacramento, California

Characterize Existing and Future Populations (By Jurisdiction)

See Chapter 2, Tables 2-14 and 2-15: Existing and Future Trail Needs per County of San Diego Baseline.

Identify the trails to which the fee or land dedication is to be applied (Step 2)

This step narrows the number of trails to only those that would be included in a particular fee or land dedication program. For the County of San Diego, this would include only those trails the County wishes to commit to implementing. However, should it be deemed appropriate for a Community Area to be involved to include Community Trails, or should a City within San Diego County wish to participate to include yet additional trails, then the same approach would be used. In the particular scenario outlined below, it is assumed that the County of San Diego's program would be limited to only Regional Trails. The purpose of focusing on Regional Trails is threefold:

-
- \$ their purpose is to support, by definition, trail use throughout all parts of the county and in turn should be supported by all (or most) development throughout the county;
 - \$ by limiting the trails in the program and their associated costs for land acquisition and development it would be easier to argue as "fair and reasonable"; and
 - \$ the argument that a trail which services only one community of one side of the county should not be paid for by a development on the other side of the county is diffused.

Characterize the Proposed Regional Trail System

Identify and focus the proposed trail routes of statewide and countywide significance; these could include:

- \$ Statewide Trail Routes: (as identified in the California Statewide Plan Trails, see page 3-38, or the California Coastal Plan, for example)
 - San Diego-Anza Borrego Desert Trail
 - Pacific Ocean Trail/California Coastal Trail
 - California Riding and Hiking Trail
 - South Coast Range Trail
- \$ San Diego County Regional Trail Routes
 - The Trans County Trail
 - The San Dieguito River Park Trail
 - The Otay Valley Regional Park Trail

Though of significance, not included is the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail was created by an act of Congress. It is the sole responsibility of the Federal Government to develop, operate, and maintain the trail with no dependency on local government participation. Such is not the case, for example, with trails identified in the California Statewide Trail Plan where local participation is key to those planned routes being realized.

Refine Regional Trail System Responsibilities

The following steps would apply to a land dedication or development fee program that involved only the County of San Diego. It could be applied to any combination of jurisdictions (e.g. County and Community Planning Areas, County and Cities) should there be such interest and appropriate cooperative legal mechanisms were established.

Characterize County Responsibility

Identify and map the portions of the Regional Trail Route System that fall within the unincorporated jurisdiction of the County.

Characterize the General Pattern of Public/Private Responsibilities

For the Regional Trail Route segments that are within the unincorporated jurisdiction of the county, identify, map, and estimate the length (in miles), by segment, those Regional Trail Routes that fall within of public lands. Public lands include:

- \$ Federal lands (Forest Service, BLM, Military)
- \$ State lands
- \$ City lands
- \$ County-owned lands (parks, road rights-of-way)
- \$ Other public lands including public utilities and public watershed

Identify, map, and estimate the length (in miles), by segment, those Regional Trail routes that fall within privately owned properties. Privately owned lands include all land outside public lands.

Characterize Area of Need for Trails

The purpose of characterizing a specific area where trails are most needed is to clearly establish where a reasonable relationship would exist between a proposed land use change or development proposed and the use of trails.

Identify, map, and estimate the length (in miles), by segment, of those Regional Trail Routes that fall on privately owned properties and that are within a 30-minute driving time (radius) from population centers and the regional highway network (see Figure 2-5). Designate these as "Regional Trail General Alignment Routes/Private." The remainder of trails within the 30-minute driving time should be labeled as "Regional Trail Routes/Public." Trail routes within a 30-minute driving time of population centers and the regional highway network reflect the findings by the State that most recreation occurs close to home. Population centers are identified as the more densely populated communities within the county as illustrated in Figure 2-4. Those trails within the 30-minute driving time of these population centers would most benefit county residents based on the survey questions about travel time to trails conducted as part of this assessment. As an option, a 15-minute driving time could be selected, which would further narrow the trail routes in the program.

Determine the reasonable relationship between the fees and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed (Step 3)

Document the Benefits of Trails by Land Use Category.

Document the benefits of trails for different land uses using existing Market Research/Economic Benefit Reports on the value of trails and/or open space. Take a broad approach in defining the purposes for trails (transportation, recreation, health), the types and ages of users, and the benefits accrued. Take an equally broad, but reasonable approach for land uses that benefit from trails (residential, commercial, industrial/parks, etc.).

Part of establish a nexus is showing the benefits to different land uses within the County. The relationship between the benefits of trails differing land uses is characterized in Table 3-2 below. The specific benefits listed for trails are further explained in Section 2.3 and 2.3.3.

Table 3-2. Benefits to Land Use Within the County

Land Use Category	Trail Benefits							
	Recreation	Economic	Educational	Environmental	Transportation	Historic	Access	Health/ Quality of Life
Residential	X	X		X	X		X	X
Commercial	X	X		X	X		X	X
Industrial				X	X			X
Agricultural								X
Public/Semi-Public	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ecological Resource Area			X	X	X		X	
Park/Open Space	X		X	X	X	X	X	X

Determine the relationship between trails and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed. This process is similar to County's Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (Step 4)

Characterize the Nexus/Rough Proportionality

Identify "Trail Fee Zones"

Estimate the length (in miles) of the designated "Regional Trail Routes/Private " within a 30-minute driving time (radius) from population centers of the individual Community / Sub-regional Plan Area. As an option, a 15-minute driving time could be selected to further narrow the trail routes in the program.

Identify "Trail Impact Costs"

Project the trail development costs for the total length of designated "Regional Trail Routes/Private" within each Trail Fee Zone using the average trail costs for a Countywide multi-purpose trail. This can be refined based on the type of trail standard called for in the Countywide Trail Master Plan (paved multi-use trail; natural surfaced multi-use trail; double-track riding and hiking trail; single track riding and hiking trail).

Identify Probable Land Development Scenarios

Project the level of new development (in acres) anticipated within each Trail Fee Zone (from above step) for each General Plan land use type. An alternative to using the General Plan land use types would be to use the categorical structure associated with the County transportation impact fee system.

Weigh Trail Impact Responsibility/Assign Trail Impact Fees

Assigning a fee that would be both fair and reasonably proportional involves two variables. First, weight each land use type by the proportional benefit that individual land use would accrue. This would be done by assigning a weight to each land use category based on the relative benefits identified in Table 3.2. Second, divide the total Trail Impact Costs for each Trail Fee Zone by the assigned weighting and then by the total projected development anticipated for each land use type (from previous step). This results in a proportional assignment of all trail costs by land use category. An individual project (based on the project size) could then be levied as to its proportional responsibility.

3.4.3 Conclusions

The first basic requirement associated with a trail nexus analysis is establishing a beneficial relationship between a proposed development and the need for trails. Satisfying this requirement is relatively straightforward and easy to accomplish based on the information available in this document. Most land uses would benefit from access to trails in one or more ways.

The second requirement is to identify the rough proportionality between the amount of an exaction and both the impacts generated by the development of the project and the benefit, which accrues to the specific development from the exaction. This is somewhat more problematic, and the main reason why no California jurisdiction has conducted a nexus study specifically relating to trails alone. It is more typical that trail development costs and/or land dedications are requested by local jurisdictions as part of an overall entitlement or permitting process and based on the existence of a trail section in the General Plan. This would include both General Plan policies and a related plan map.

Should the County of San Diego wish to formally institute a development impact fee or require land dedication specifically for trails the following should be considered.

- \$ Land dedication requirements for trails could be viewed as competing with Quimby Act requirements for parks.
- \$ If proportionality and benefit is to be proven Countywide, then the more focused the trail system is on regional needs and the more limited in extent, the better.
- \$ Other financial mechanisms will also likely be required to implement an effective, usable trail network that includes regional and local trails.
- \$ Operation and management costs will continue to require separate funding.

The recommended approach is to focus any trail-related development impact fees or land dedication requirements on Regional Trail routes that are located on private property within unincorporated county lands. If individual Community / Sub-regional Plan areas wish to complement regional routes with more local trails, they could use the same nexus model for local community trail projects.

3.5 ENFORCEMENT AND MANAGEMENT ISSUES

The following enforcement issues would be associated with the implementation of a trail system within the county. Enforcement issues also identify trail rules to restrict activities that would be considered harmful to the trail and its users. These issues are identified to establish what areas of enforcement and subsequent management elements the County may need to address. This will also allow a better understanding of the possible implications with maintenance and management policies and the related costs for a system of trails.

3.5.1 Day Use Management

County trails are intended for day use only and evening use of the trails should be prohibited. Trail signage would indicate this restriction. Evening closures serve several purposes:

- \$ Limiting the hours of use would reduce the impact of the trail on neighboring private properties.
- \$ Limited hours would allow for enforcement personnel to take corrective action against violators on the trail who may have criminal intent.

A simple brochure could be prepared and distributed to trail users. This distribution could occur at trailheads or area stores that cater to trail users. The brochure should identify:

- \$ Standard trail etiquette (see Appendix T).
- \$ Emergency contact phone numbers.
- \$ Possible information on how the public can assist in the implementation or maintenance of the system through donations, public involvement and volunteer groups.

The only exceptions to this day-use only policy would be the pathways that are within public rights-of-way. Pathways within public road rights-of-way or transportation corridors could consider nighttime use if lighting and other necessary improvements are available.

Trails, especially those that cross private lands, may require gates needing management to avoid unauthorized entry. At trail heads the entry point to trails can also be gated and a posting of hours for trail use should be provided. Where trailheads are located outside of county lands (such as schools or other private lands) other management agreements will need to be established to ensure the trails are properly used.

3.5.2 Trail Use Restrictions

Trails may be restricted to a particular type of user. This would be known as a “Limited Use” trail and would require posting to identify allowed user types. An example of this would be an equestrian/hiking trail that would not allow for bikes. In addition to posting, appropriate type barriers should be provided to discourage unauthorized users. Trails and pathways that allow dogs would require that dogs be leashed.

3.5.3 Trail Closures

Trail closures will need to occur from time to time for the purpose of construction, seasonal maintenance and repair. Environmentally or biologically sensitive areas may be closed during special seasonal purposes or during high fire hazard conditions. Trails may also be closed when weather renders the trail dangerous such as during floods or landslides. Trail closure could also occur when agricultural uses such as spraying or harvesting conflict with trail users. In any of the above cases the trails should be posted as to why the trail is closed. The County will need to manage procedures to make sure that the posting of trails occurs when they are needed. See Section 3.2.7 for possible trail closure procedures within agricultural areas.

3.5.4 Private Access to Public Trails

No private access should be provided to public trails except where a designated trailhead occurs. The County should develop criteria on what would be considered appropriate private access to public trails and limit where access can occur. Fencing may need to be used to define the limits of the trail width through private lands and to establish areas of maintenance responsibility.

3.5.5 Trail Monitoring and Maintenance

Establish a method for inventorying all county trails on a yearly basis. This inventory would include: drainage, vegetation clearing, erosion problems, signage, removal of any encroachments, and any necessary repairs of structures such as gates, fences and barriers.

3.5.6 Trail Patrol and Information

Establish an entity that would be responsible for the updating of trail information and maps. Trail maps should also provide trail use rules, emergency information, trail accessibility and other related information.

3.5.7 Trail Supervision

Minimum Presence

The County should patrol all trails to assure that they are maintained and are safe and usable and that the associated rules are being followed. A level of service should be used that is similar to those provided for public parks. This is of particular importance when trails cross private lands.

Use of Volunteers

Use volunteers, where possible, to assist in monitoring trail issues such as safety, security, maintenance, and litter. This is not to replace direct monitoring by County personnel.

Staffing

A trail management plan should be prepared that identifies a level of service by staff needed to operate and maintain the proposed trail segment(s).

3.5.8 Comparison of Other County or Municipal Agencies

A comparison to other counties in Southern California regarding trail enforcement issues was made. Discussion with trail staff and investigation of General Plan language for the counties of Riverside, Orange, and San Bernardino indicate that each of the counties have similar trail enforcement policies as described above. Currently, the Counties interviewed address their enforcement issues within their maintenance program and related budget. None of the counties addressed all of the issues outlined above. However, all the counties address the general issues of enforcement through their management or maintenance policies.

3.5.9 Conclusions

To provide proper enforcement the County needs to establish regulations and requirements of the County's Trail System. All of the issues stated above will need to be addressed. Prior to developing and opening a Countywide trail to public use, a trail management plan should be prepared. This management plan should identify the level of personnel needed to operate, enforce and maintain the trail relative to the stated regulations and requirements.

3.6 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a list of recommendations that are based on the analysis of opportunities and constraints related to trail implementation. These recommendations will be used to evaluate the four possible Strategic Trail Options discussed in Chapter 5. These goals should also be used to describe and define the recreational trail needs and initiate the recommended basic General Plan language:

- \$ Use lands already in public ownership or proposed for public acquisition wherever possible for trail alignments. This would be in preference to the acquisition of privately owned properties.
- \$ Provide trail routes that meet the public need while respecting the rights of property owners.
- \$ Acquire private lands for trails when necessary to insure the completion of an interconnection to a community trail or Regional Trail System. Secure trail access through purchase, easements, dedication or by other means from a willing property owner/seller.
- \$ Locate trail routes to highlight the County's recreational educational experiences, including natural scenic, cultural and historic resources.
- \$ Establish new trails in locations that will not impact sensitive environmental resources.
- \$ Coordinate all elements of trail planning, acquisitions, development, and management with all of the jurisdictions within San Diego County. Establish an inter-jurisdictional technical committee from all jurisdictions involved with the specific trail alignment.
- \$ Review and revise the current General Plan element/policy so that it can be easily interpreted and modified by the County Department that administers the Trail Program.
- \$ Identify a specific County Department for the Trail Program. This department should have the administrative, funding, maintenance and operational resources to make the Trail Program a success.
- \$ Continue to allow for and encourage volunteer groups to assist in the Trail Program.
- \$ Allow for the continued involvement and input of the agricultural community to help identify trail opportunities within agricultural areas. Establish guidelines for trails that address the concerns and issues of the agricultural community.

-
- \$ Indemnify all persons granting an easement or other land owners immediately adjoining a County Regional or Community Trail.
 - \$ Establish as many alternatives to acquire properties for trail implementation as possible to ensure economic viability for the Trail Program.
 - \$ Establish a nexus and proportionality that will allow mandatory dedication of land for trail easements. This would be required for all County development approvals where Regional and Community Trails are to be located.
 - \$ Establish a management plan that outlines the rules and regulations for the Trail Program.

This page intentionally left blank